



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 167

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 26, 2021

No. 130

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 26, 2021.

I hereby appoint the Honorable NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 2021, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with time equally allocated between the parties and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

NOW IS TIME TO BACK THE BLUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. JOYCE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, across our country, parents are facing a new and scary reality this summer. As soccer camps and Little League games get back underway, there is a new and growing crime crisis that is threatening our communities.

Just last week, President Biden made the extraordinarily false comment that crime is down. President Biden is

wrong. We are seeing a rise in crime throughout American cities.

In Philadelphia, there have been 315 homicides this year, an increase of over 35 percent from last year. This is unacceptable.

The people living in our communities deserve to feel safe. While families worry about the growing crime crisis, liberal leaders have turned their backs and failed to protect our neighborhoods.

Across the country, mayors and community leaders have condemned the police officers and joined protests calling to defund law enforcement. They have failed to support our police officers as the police officers are battling, firsthand, this crime wave. This dangerous rhetoric makes our communities less safe. Now is definitely not the time to defund the police.

Tragically, ambush-style attacks on law enforcement have increased 91 percent since last year. These attacks have been deadly, and unfortunately, 155 police officers have given their lives in the line of duty.

This is not the time to play games, and this is not the time to cut funding for body armor and safety equipment that protect our officers who are on the front lines.

Now more than ever, we must stand with our law enforcement officers. We must stand with our heroes to keep us safe each and every day. We must ensure that they have the tools and the training to protect themselves from harm while they protect us and protect our communities.

Now is the time to back the blue.

Now is the time to support our law enforcement.

Now is the time to speak out against the dangerous rhetoric that puts the lives of the men and women in blue in danger.

A NATION IN FINANCIAL JEOPARDY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MURPHY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, we could talk about so many things today on how the Democrats are tearing this Nation apart: the immigration crisis, the attack on the American family, the destruction of race relations, skyrocketing crime because of the defund the police movement.

Madam Speaker, I could go on and on. But today, we will talk about the financial disaster that the Biden administration is causing.

There is no doubt that the Democrats' outrageous, reckless, and out-of-control spending is putting our Nation in financial jeopardy. However, I cannot help but notice that Democrats in this Chamber systematically fail to address the deeply personal and palpable impact of this administration's financial irresponsibility.

To my colleagues across the aisle, please understand that inflation is severely hurting American families and their ability to create and sustain financial security.

Over the weekend, I spoke to a restaurant owner who told me that due to soaring costs of goods and services, he will have to raise prices to make ends meet. I have many constituents on fixed incomes who tell me that they are having to eliminate food off their grocery lists in order to afford family meals.

Skyrocketing costs present a serious problem for American families and workers, and under this administration, costs do not seem to be going down anytime soon.

In fact, inflation has increased every single month since Joe Biden took office. Gas prices are at their highest

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H3849

level since 2014. Thirteen million individuals are still on some type of unemployment, while over 9 million jobs remain unfilled.

This type of scenario is essentially unheard of and totally artificially created by the Biden administration. They failed to get the \$15 minimum wage, so now they have artificially cut the American workforce in an attempt to force wages upward. Such a forced, quick increase in wages will undoubtedly be inflationary as small businesses, and even large fast food chains, will have to raise their prices just to maintain viability.

Do they think the American people are that stupid? Endless borrowing has consequences. Republican lawmakers see this every day as ordinary Americans are having to bear the cost of excessive Democrat spending. At the gas pump, in the grocery store, at the mall, and at the car dealership, my constituents are having to spend more of their hard-earned dollars just to get to work, feed their children, and care for loved ones.

The numbers don't lie. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, gas prices are up 45 percent from last year; used car prices are up 45 percent; airfare is up 24 percent; and hotel prices are up 16 percent. At the grocery store, bacon is up 8 percent; fruit prices are up 7 percent; fish prices are up 6 percent; and milk is up 5 percent. Even to pour a cup of coffee, Americans are feeling the cost of the Democrats' reckless spending spree.

Unfortunately, under Biden's leadership, the situation looks bleak. House Democrats are well accustomed to spending beyond their means, but they routinely ignore its negative impact on the American people.

What is worse is that experts agree the Democrats' far-left proposals will undoubtedly lead to higher taxes on the vast majority of middle-class American families.

Here is what we know. A recent report from the Tax Policy Center found that Biden's tax plan will increase taxes on an astounding 75 percent of middle-class Americans and raise taxes on 95 percent of Americans by 2031. This broken policy work has real consequences that are completely unsustainable.

Another study by the Wharton School of Business shows that Biden's \$6 trillion budget would slow economic growth, shrink the American economy, and cut workers' hours and wages. In fact, annualized real wages are already down by 3.95 percent since 2020.

Madam Speaker, I implore my colleagues across the aisle to listen to their constituents and sympathize with what they are going through. More than that, I urge them to recognize that we, as lawmakers, have a responsibility to care for our citizens and ensure that Big Government policies do not squander American families and small businesses.

Look, this should be simple. All Americans understand that to stay fi-

nancially viable and intact, they must stick to a budget and spend within their means.

I encourage the Biden administration and its Democratic cohorts in the House to balance their own checkbooks immediately for the sake of the American people and to stop this reckless spending spree.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, as we set our sights on the week ahead, we do so with a certain degree of anticipation and anxiety. There is much to discuss, many concerns to address, and a wide array of perspectives to consider.

By Your gracious guidance, as You lead us into these next couple days, call us to pay attention to Your inimitable wisdom, to turn our ears to Your words, that we would keep them within our hearts.

Above all else, may each of us keep watch over our innermost souls, knowing that everything we do reflects its integrity.

Keep our mouths from perversity and corrupt talk from our lips.

But remind us to look straight ahead with purpose, fixing our gaze, today and throughout the week, on the goals You would have us reach.

And may we be intent on taking heed of Your direction.

May we be steadfast in all we do.

May we be worthy of this place in time to serve You, this country, and our communities.

In the strength of Your name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to section 11(a) of House Resolution 188, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IMPACTS OF CLIMATE CRISIS

(Mrs. DINGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I stood here nearly a month ago to deliver a very similar message: once-in-a-lifetime storms are becoming our reality in Michigan.

In the last month, southeast Michigan has flooded three times in the city of Dearborn, nearly 20,000 homes have been impacted. My constituents can't recover from one flood before it worsens and another one hits and there is more damaged property, more lost valuables.

People are angry. People are scared. And they have every right to be. That is because we have known the solution to these disasters for a while. The time for climate action is now. This starts with investing in resilient infrastructure to protect our communities from the impacts of climate crisis.

We need to invest in infrastructure that can withstand natural disasters and make it easier on the American people to recover. We can't continue to have these floods couched as once-in-a-lifetime, if you call them that, when people are dealing with unimaginable damages in my city for the third time in 4 weeks.

We need a strong infrastructure package that takes bold action and addresses change head-on.

BIDEN BORDER CRISIS

(Mr. NEHLS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. NEHLS. Mr. Speaker, it is nearly August, a full 7 months since the Biden administration assumed control of the White House, and still there is no end in sight for the Biden border crisis.

It has been a month since Biden border czar, KAMALA HARRIS, hopped off of her jet for 90 minutes for a photo shoot near the border, which she dubbed as a southern border visit, and still nothing has changed.

March was the highest month on record for illegal crossings until April. April was the highest month on record for illegal crossings until May. May was the highest month on record for illegal crossings until June. And we are on pace to set another record in July.

How many records must be broken, crimes committed, victims trafficked before the Biden administration wakes

up to the roaring crisis at our southern border?

The American people are sick and tired of the talk. They are sick and tired of excuses. They are sick and tired of the political games. Enough is enough. Secure the southern border.

D.C. STATEHOOD

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, with a detailed poll showing that 54 percent of the American people now support statehood for our Nation's capital, the District of Columbia, we are optimistic about passage in the Senate of H.R. 51.

I thank the House for passage of our statehood bill, for that passage has spurred the American majority that now supports D.C. statehood. The recent hearing in the Senate helped further educate Americans about our statehood bill, noting that our country is the only democratic country that denies equal representation for the people of its capital.

With continuing success with our D.C. statehood bill, we look forward to reporting progress on our bill on becoming the State of Washington, Douglass Commonwealth.

RECOGNIZING ERIN KERKHOFF

(Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a young woman in my district who has become an inspiration to women and athletes everywhere.

Erin Kerkhoff, a University of Northern Iowa sophomore and track star from Solon High School, earned a position on Team USA for the Paralympics in Tokyo.

Kerkhoff, who has 20/400 vision due to optic nerve degeneration in both eyes is ranked fifth in the world in the 400-meter dash after achieving a personal record of 58.23 seconds in the qualifying trials earlier this month, finishing second overall in both the 400- and 100-meter dashes.

The Second District and the State of Iowa are lucky to be represented by stellar athletes like Erin, Thomas Gilman, and Kenny Bednarek competing in this year's summer Olympics.

I could not be prouder to represent these three in Congress. Good luck Erin, Thomas, and Kenny, and bring home the gold.

Last week, I wished my sister Mari-Eleanor Martino a happy birthday, and this week I would like to extend a happy birthday to her husband, Ralph Martino. Happy birthday, Ralph, and we are delighted to have you in the family.

RACIAL EQUITY IN AMERICA JOBS AND FAMILY PLAN

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration's proposed \$2.65 trillion American Jobs Plan contains a commitment of resources and investments to overcome structural economic inequity, driven by decades of racial and gender discrimination and exclusion.

In addition to being undercapitalized by the PPP in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, Black business owners experienced an acute decline of 41 percent in their numbers; Latinx businesses fell by 32 percent; Asian businesses, 26 percent. Compounding these inequities, Black, Indigenous, and people of color, particularly, women of color, have been hardest hit by unemployment and job losses.

These groups have been left behind and held back for far too long, resulting in multigenerational poverty, wage, and wealth gaps. To meet the moment, House Democrats are proposing systemic solutions rooted in equity to ensure prosperity for all Americans. These solutions are driven by targeted, long-term investments to improve our infrastructure by igniting our economy for equity, baking in accountability to equitable practices and outcomes and fostering an ecosystem where the safety, health, and well-being of the people are a priority.

DOOR-TO-DOOR IN ORWELLIAN FASHION

(Mr. BIGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, Biden's team of neighborhood, basically, disturbers, showed up at a constituent's house this past weekend demanding that they reveal their vaccine status, after asking for them by name.

Our agents on the border cannot test the tens of thousands that are being released into the country on a monthly basis, and tens of thousands are going in without COVID testing and without vaccines. But Biden-Harris, the first President with a hyphenated name, is going door-to-door in an Orwellian fashion to pester Americans about vaccines.

Welcome to the authoritarian turn of the new Democrat party.

2020 ELECTION

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, is anyone else tired of hearing the insurrectionist in Chief continue to lie about the 2020 election?

Over the weekend, once again, the former, twice-impeached, disgraced, so-

called President of the United States of America, falsely claimed that he actually won the election, and that it was stolen from him by Joe Biden.

Something is really wrong with this guy. And I need some help in trying to figure it out.

Is Donald Trump, A, a pathological liar;

B, a sociopath;

C, a malignant narcissist; or

D, all of the above?

I will be around all week. Look forward to hearing from you.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEVIN of Michigan) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 26, 2021.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 26, 2021, at 1:41 p.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 89.

That the Senate passed S. 189.

That the Senate passed S. 894.

That the Senate passed S. 1910.

That the Senate passed S. 2382.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

CHERYL L. JOHNSON,
Clerk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

CONSIDER TEACHERS ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 848) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 in order to improve the service obligation verification process for TEACH Grant recipients, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 848

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Consider Teachers Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. TEACH GRANTS.

Section 420N of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070g-2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by inserting "(referred to in this section as the 'service obligation window') after 'under this subpart';

(B) in subparagraph (C)(vii), by inserting “or geographic area” after “field”; and

(C) by striking subparagraphs (D) and (E) and inserting the following:

“(D) submit a certification of employment by the chief administrative officer of the school in accordance with subsection (d)(5); and

“(E) meet all State certification requirements for teaching (which may include meeting such requirements through a certification obtained through alternative routes to teaching);”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by striking “In the event” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) RECONSIDERATION OF CONVERSION DECISIONS.—

“(A) REQUEST TO RECONSIDER.—In any case where the Secretary has determined that a recipient of a grant under this subpart has failed or refused to comply with the service obligation in the agreement under subsection (b) and has converted the grant into a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan under part D in accordance with paragraph (1), (including a TEACH Grant converted to a loan prior to the date of enactment of the Consider Teachers Act of 2021 and including cases where such loans have been fully or partially paid), the recipient may request that the Secretary reconsider such initial determination and may submit additional information to demonstrate satisfaction of the service obligation. Upon receipt of such a request, the Secretary shall reconsider the determination in accordance with this paragraph not later than 90 days after the date that such request was received.

“(B) RECONSIDERATION.—If, in reconsidering an initial determination under subparagraph (A) (including reconsideration related to a TEACH Grant that was converted to a loan prior to the date of enactment of the Consider Teachers Act of 2021 and including cases where such loans were fully or partially paid), the Secretary determines that the reason for such determination was the recipient’s failure to timely submit a certification required under subsection (b)(1)(D) (as in effect on the day before the date of enactment of the Consider Teachers Act of 2021), an error or processing delay by the Secretary, a change to the fields considered eligible for fulfillment of the service obligation (as described in subsection (b)(1)(C)), a recipient having previously requested to have the TEACH Grant converted to a loan, or another valid reason determined by the Secretary, and that the recipient has, as of the date of the reconsideration, demonstrated that the recipient did meet, or is meeting the service obligation in the agreement under subsection (b), the Secretary shall—

“(i) discharge the Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan under part D, and reinstate the recipient’s grant under this subpart;

“(ii) discharge any interest or fees that may have accumulated during the period that the grant was converted to a Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan under part D;

“(iii) if the recipient has other loans under part D, apply any payments made for the Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan under part D during such period to those other loans under part D;

“(iv) if the recipient does not have other loans under part D, reimburse the recipient for any amounts paid on the Federal Direct Unsubsidized Stafford Loan under part D during such period;

“(v) request that consumer reporting agencies remove any negative credit reporting

due to the conversion of the TEACH Grant to a loan; and

“(vi) use the additional information provided under subparagraph (A) to determine the progress the recipient has made in meeting the service obligation.

“(C) EXTENSION OF TIME TO COMPLETE SERVICE OBLIGATION.—In the case of a recipient whose TEACH Grant was reinstated in accordance with subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall, upon such reinstatement—

“(i) extend the time remaining for the recipient to fulfill the service obligation described in subsection (b)(1) to a period of time equal to—

“(I) 8 years; minus

“(II) the number of full academic years of teaching that the recipient completed prior to the reconversion of the loan to a TEACH Grant under subparagraph (B), including any years of qualifying teaching completed during the period when the TEACH Grant was in loan status; and

“(ii) treat any full academic years of teaching described in clause (i)(II) as years that count toward the individual’s service obligation (regardless of whether the TEACH Grant funds were in grant or loan status) if that time otherwise meets the requirements of this section.”; and

(3) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(3) COMMUNICATION WITH RECIPIENTS.—The Secretary shall notify TEACH grant recipients not less than once per calendar year regarding how to submit the employment certification under subsection (b)(1)(D) and the recommendations and requirements for submitting that certification under subsection (d)(5).

“(4) QUALIFYING SCHOOLS AND HIGH-NEED FIELDS.—The Secretary shall maintain and annually update a list of qualifying schools as described in subsection (b)(1)(B), and a list of high-need fields as described in subsection (b)(1)(C) and shall make such lists publicly available on the Department’s website in a sortable and searchable format.”.

SEC. 3. SUBMISSION OF EMPLOYMENT CERTIFICATION.

Section 420N(d) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070g–2(d)), as amended by section 2, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) SUBMISSION OF EMPLOYMENT CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) RECOMMENDED SUBMISSIONS.—The Secretary shall notify TEACH Grant recipients that the Department recommends that TEACH Grant recipients submit the employment certification described in subsection (b)(1)(D) as soon as practicable after the completion of each year of service.

“(B) REQUIRED SUBMISSION.—A TEACH Grant recipient shall be required to submit to the Department employment certification within the timeframe that would allow that individual to complete their service obligation before the end of the service obligation window.

“(C) NOTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall notify TEACH Grant recipients of the required submission deadlines described in this paragraph.

“(D) ADJUSTMENT OF DEADLINE.—The Secretary shall adjust the submission deadline described in subparagraph (B) to account for a service obligation window extension.

“(E) ALTERNATIVE TO CERTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall provide an alternative to the certification of employment described in subsection (b)(1)(D) for recipients who cannot obtain such required certification of employment from the chief administrative officer of the school because the recipient can demonstrate the school is no longer in existence or the school refuses to cooperate.”.

SEC. 4. EXTENSION OF TIME TO FULFILL SERVICE OBLIGATION DUE TO COVID-19.

(a) Section 3519(a) of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136; 20 U.S.C. 1001 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “For the purpose of section 420N of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070g–2), during a qualifying emergency,” and inserting “Notwithstanding any provision of subpart 9 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070g et seq.),”; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(3) in paragraph (2), by striking “such section 420N.” and inserting “section 420N of such Act; and”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) shall extend the service obligation window (as described in section 420N(b)(1)(A) of such Act) for a period of not more than 3 years, in addition to any extensions provided in accordance with subpart 9 of part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1070g et seq.), in the case of a grant recipient whose service obligation window begins during, or includes—

“(A) the qualifying emergency period; or

“(B) a period of recession or economic downturn related to the qualifying emergency period, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Secretary of Labor.”.

(b) Section 3519 of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136; 20 U.S.C. 1001 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) FEDERAL PERKINS LOANS.—Notwithstanding section 465 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1087ee), the Secretary shall waive the requirements of such section in regard to full-time service and shall consider an incomplete year of service of a borrower as fulfilling the requirement for a complete year of service under such section, if the service was interrupted due to a qualifying emergency.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the CARES Act (Public Law 116–136).

SEC. 5. IMPLEMENTATION.

In carrying out this Act and any amendments made by this Act, or any regulations promulgated under this Act or under such amendments, the Secretary of Education may waive the application of—

(1) subchapter I of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”);

(2) the master calendar requirements under section 482 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1089);

(3) negotiated rulemaking under section 492 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1098a); and

(4) the requirement to publish the notices related to the system of records of the agency before implementation required under paragraphs (4) and (11) of section 552a(e) of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Privacy Act of 1974”), except that the notices shall be published not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and the gentlewoman from Indiana (Mrs. SPARTZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 848, the Consider Teachers Act of 2021.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 848, the Consider Teachers Act, introduced by Senators BRAUN and SINEMA in the Senate, and led by Delegate HOLMES NORTON and Representative SPARTZ in the House.

High quality teachers are the backbone of our Nation's education system. Yet, since even before the COVID-19 pandemic, communities across the country, particularly low-income communities, have faced a growing shortage of educators.

□ 1415

To address this shortage, the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education grant program, or the TEACH grant program, offers up-front grant aid to incentivize individuals to pursue teaching and serve in low-income communities.

Since 2007 these grants have helped people across the country become high-quality teachers in the communities where they are needed most. However, administrative issues with the program have inadvertently converted thousands of these grants into loans which must be paid back with interest. According to an investigative report in 2016, upwards of 63 percent of TEACH grants had been converted to loans, leaving badly needed teachers with burdensome debt.

The bipartisan bill we are considering today addresses these issues in two key ways: First, it implements a reconsideration process to ensure TEACH grant recipients do not see their grants converted into loans by mistake; and, second, the bill creates flexibility so that teachers can still fulfill the grant's requirements in light of school closures and disruptions caused by the pandemic.

Simply put, the Consider Teachers Act is a bipartisan legislative fix which will ensure TEACH grants can continue to strengthen and expand our Nation's teacher workforce.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SPARTZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Consider Teachers Act. When created, the TEACH grant program was to support students interested in becoming teachers. Unfortunately, the grant program has run into administrative challenges brought on by clerical and paperwork issues. Because of these issues,

approximately two-thirds of all TEACH grants are converting into Federal student loans.

To address these inadvertent errors, the Consider Teachers Act reforms the program to ensure that teachers are not indebted due to simple mistakes. First, the legislation gives grant recipients the ability to reverse a conversion and eases the timeline for when the grant recipients must certify their employment with the Department of Education.

Second, the bill also extends the time grant recipients have to fulfill their service obligation in response to the challenges posed by the pandemic. The pandemic upended all of our lives, and teachers who lost their job shouldn't be unfairly punished for circumstances outside of their control.

Mr. Speaker, with the TEACH grant program, the Federal Government made a commitment to future teachers, and the Consider Teachers Act fulfills the original promise of the program. I urge all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 848, the Consider Teachers Act of 2021. I introduced the companion bill with Congresswoman VICTORIA SPARTZ. I would like to thank Senators MIKE BRAUN and KYRSTEN SINEMA also for their leadership on this bill, and my good friend, Chairman BOBBY SCOTT, for bringing this bill to the floor today.

This bill would improve the service obligation verification process for the Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program, or TEACH grant program, as it is called. The TEACH grant program was created to attract the best and brightest to the teaching profession in underserved communities. The TEACH grant program provides up to \$4,000 a year in grants to students who agree to serve for at least 4 years as full-time teachers in a high-need field in a public or private elementary or secondary school that serves low-income families. The obligation to teach 4 years must be completed within an 8-year period. Those who do not fulfill their service requirement have their grants converted into Federal direct unsubsidized Stafford loans which must be paid back with interest. These loans cannot revert to grants.

According to the Office of Management and Budget, 66 percent of the grants are converted into loans. Though 21,000 grant recipients have completed the program without conversion, 94,000 recipients have had their grants converted to loans. Those conversions are often triggered by small paperwork issues, such as submitting the annual form 1 day late or missing a date or signature.

In 2018, the U.S. Department of Education released a reconsideration process for recipients who had their grants converted into loans but had either fulfilled, or could still fulfill, their service obligations. The department also turned back the clock to allow teachers who had left the TEACH grant program once their grants were converted to loans to give them more time to complete their service obligations. These changes allowed the department to lift the debt of 2,300 recipients.

I am pleased that the department made additional improvements to the program on July 1, 2021, including opening the reconsideration process to all TEACH grant program recipients. This bill would codify some of these changes, creating a safeguard from changes in department leadership.

This bill would also outline yearly deadlines and notification requirements to rectify some of the TEACH grant program's previous administrative mishaps. Furthermore, with the onset of the coronavirus pandemic, many recipients have had trouble finding qualifying work. This bill would create a grace period for those individuals by extending the service obligation fulfillment period by 3 years for anyone who was fulfilling their obligations when the coronavirus pandemic began.

This past year has given us all a hard lesson in the invaluable service that teachers and educators provide to our society. As many young students have turned to homeschooling and remote learning, we have all come to appreciate the hard work and incredible talent of our teachers who foster the mental, physical, and emotional growth of our children every day. This bill ensures that that pipeline of talent for the teaching profession remains strong and that we do not unduly burden TEACH grant program recipients who have dedicated themselves to serving our most vulnerable communities.

I understand what that means because my own mother, Vela Holmes, was a teacher in the D.C. Public Schools.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mrs. SPARTZ. In closing, Mr. Speaker, the TEACH grant program fails too many of our teachers, and it needs to be fixed. It is important that our Federal Government honors its promises. The Consider Teachers Act creates flexibility and streamlines processes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote in favor of this bill. Strong teachers are essential for high-quality learning.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate again my thanks to Representative SPARTZ and Delegate NORTON for working across the aisle on this bipartisan priority in the House.

As my colleagues have reiterated, the TEACH grant program is supposed to

help prepare high quality and diverse educators for our Nation's underserved students. Today it is critical that the TEACH grant program actually works as intended as we recover from a global health emergency that cost education jobs, exacerbated achievement gaps, and worsened the teacher shortage in many States and districts. That is why we must ensure that Federal initiatives to strengthen the teacher workforce make it easier, not harder, for individuals to enter the teaching profession.

The Consider Teaching Act would help achieve this goal by ensuring that TEACH grants do not have the unintended effect of leaving educators with burdensome loans. This simple yet urgent step will allow prospective teachers across the country to continue accessing the resources they need to pursue careers in teaching.

Importantly, this bill is an opportunity to demonstrate that regardless of party affiliation, each of us in Congress shares a commitment to improving the quality of education by investing in well-prepared teachers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, again, to support the bill and vote for the Consider Teachers Act.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 848.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

HELPING AMERICAN VICTIMS AFFLICTED BY NEUROLOGICAL ATTACKS ACT OF 2021

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1828) to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 to authorize the provision of payment to personnel of the Central Intelligence Agency who incur qualifying injuries to the brain, to authorize the provision of payment to personnel of the Department of State who incur similar injuries, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1828

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Helping American Victims Afflicted by Neurological Attacks Act of 2021" or the "HAVANA Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. AUTHORITY TO PAY PERSONNEL OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY FOR CERTAIN INJURIES TO THE BRAIN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" mean—

(A) the congressional intelligence committees (as that term is defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003));

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(C) the Committee on Homeland Security and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED DEPENDENT.—The term "covered dependent" has the meaning given such term in subsection (d)(1) of section 19 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3519), as added by subsection (b).

(3) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term "covered employee" has the meaning given such term in section 19A(a) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3519b(a)).

(4) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term "covered individual" has the meaning given such term in section 19A(a) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3519b(a)).

(5) QUALIFYING INJURY.—The term "qualifying injury" has the meaning given such term in subsection (d)(1) of section 19 of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3519), as added by subsection (b).

(b) PAYMENT AUTHORIZED.—Section 19A of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3519b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) AUTHORITY TO MAKE PAYMENTS FOR QUALIFYING INJURIES TO THE BRAIN.—

"(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

"(A) COVERED DEPENDENT.—The term 'covered dependent' has the meaning given such term in subsection (a), except that the assigned duty station need not be in a foreign country.

"(B) QUALIFYING INJURY.—The term 'qualifying injury' has the meaning given such term in subsection (a), except that the assigned duty station need not be in a foreign country.

"(2) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law but subject to paragraph (3), the Director may provide payment to a covered dependent, a covered employee, and a covered individual for a qualifying injury to the brain.

"(3) LIMITATIONS.—

"(A) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIRED.—Payment under paragraph (2) in a fiscal year may only be made using amounts appropriated in advance specifically for payments under such paragraph in such fiscal year.

"(B) MATTER OF PAYMENTS.—Payments under paragraph (2) using amounts appropriated for such purpose shall be made on a first come, first serve, or pro rata basis.

"(C) AMOUNTS OF PAYMENTS.—The total amount of funding obligated for payments under paragraph (2) may not exceed the amount specifically appropriated for providing payments under such paragraph during its period of availability.

"(4) REGULATIONS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.

"(B) ELEMENTS.—The regulations prescribed under subparagraph (A) shall include regulations detailing fair and equitable criteria for payment under paragraph (2)."

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Payment under subsection (d) of such section, as added by subsection (b) of this section, may be made available for a qualifying injury to the brain

that occurs before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act as the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency considers appropriate.

(d) REPORTS.—

(1) REPORT ON USE OF AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the use of the authority provided by section 19A(d) of such Act, as added by subsection (b) of this section.

(B) CONTENTS.—The report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A budget or spend plan for the use of the authority described in subparagraph (A) for the subsequent fiscal year.

(ii) Information relating to the use of the authority described in subparagraph (A) for the preceding year, including the following:

(I) The total amount expended.

(II) The number of covered dependents, covered employees, and covered individuals for whom payments were made.

(III) The amounts that were provided to each person described in subclause (II).

(iii) An assessment of whether additional authorities are required to ensure that covered dependents, covered employees, and covered individuals can receive payments for qualifying injuries, such as a qualifying injury to the back or heart.

(C) FORM.—The report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in classified form.

(2) REPORT ON ESTIMATED COSTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023.—Not later than March 1, 2022, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing an estimate of the obligation that the Director expects to incur in providing payment under section 19A(d) of such Act, as added by subsection (b) of this section, in fiscal year 2023.

(e) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall prescribe regulations required under section 19A(d)(4)(A) of such Act, as added by subsection (b) of this section.

(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the regulations prescribed in accordance with paragraph (1).

(f) CLARIFYING AMENDMENT.—Section 19A(b) of the Central Intelligence Agency Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. 3519b(b)) is amended, in the subsection heading, by inserting "TOTAL DISABILITY RESULTING FROM" before "CERTAIN INJURIES".

SEC. 3. AUTHORITY TO PAY PERSONNEL OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR CERTAIN INJURIES TO THE BRAIN.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED DEPENDENT.—The term "covered dependent" has the meaning given such term in subsection (i)(1) of section 901 of title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b), as added by subsection (b).

(3) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term "covered employee" has the meaning given such term in subsection (i)(1) of section 901 of

title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b), as added by subsection (b).

(4) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term “covered individual” has the meaning given such term in subsection (i)(1) of section 901 of title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b), as added by subsection (b).

(5) QUALIFYING INJURY.—The term “qualifying injury” has the meaning given such term in subsection (i)(1) of section 901 of title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b), as added by subsection (b).

(b) IN GENERAL.—Section 901 of title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b) is amended—

(1) in subsection (f), by striking “subsection (a) or (b)” both places it appears and inserting “subsection (a), (b), or (i)”; and

(2) in subsection (h)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “IN GENERAL.—This section” and inserting “ADJUSTMENT OF COMPENSATION PROVISION.—Subsections (a) and (b)”; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

“(2) OTHER PAYMENT PROVISION.—Payment under subsection (i) may be made available for a qualifying injury (as defined in such subsection) that occurs before, on, or after the date of the enactment of the Helping American Victims Afflicted by Neurological Attacks Act of 2021.”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(1) OTHER INJURIES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) COVERED DEPENDENT.—The term ‘covered dependent’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (e), except that the assigned duty station need not be in the Republic of Cuba, the People’s Republic of China, or another foreign country.

“(B) COVERED EMPLOYEE.—The term ‘covered employee’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (e), except that the assigned duty station need not be in the Republic of Cuba, the People’s Republic of China, or another foreign country.

“(C) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term ‘covered individual’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (e), except that the assigned duty station need not be in the Republic of Cuba, the People’s Republic of China, or another foreign country.

“(D) QUALIFYING INJURY.—The term ‘qualifying injury’ has the meaning given such term in subsection (e), except that the assigned duty station need not be in the Republic of Cuba, the People’s Republic of China, or another foreign country.

“(2) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law but subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary of State or other agency head with an employee may provide payment to a covered dependent, a dependent of a former employee, a covered employee, a former employee, and a covered individual for a qualifying injury to the brain.

“(3) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) APPROPRIATIONS REQUIRED.—Payment under paragraph (2) in a fiscal year may only be made using amounts appropriated in advance specifically for payments under such paragraph in such fiscal year.

“(B) MATTER OF PAYMENTS.—Payments under paragraph (2) using amounts appropriated for such purpose shall be made on a first come, first serve, or pro rata basis.

“(C) AMOUNTS OF PAYMENTS.—The total amount of funding obligated for payments under paragraph (2) may not exceed the amount specifically appropriated for pro-

viding payments under such paragraph during its period of availability.

“(4) REGULATIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or other agency head described in paragraph (2) that provides payment under such paragraph shall prescribe regulations to carry out this subsection.

“(B) ELEMENTS.—The regulations prescribed under subparagraph (A) shall include regulations detailing fair and equitable criteria for payment under paragraph (2).”.

(c) REPORTS.—

(1) REPORTS ON USE OF AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 365 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and each other agency head that makes a payment under subsection (i) of section 901 of title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b), as added by subsection (b) of this section, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the use of the authority provided by such subsection (i).

(B) CONTENTS.—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A budget or spend plan for the use of the authority described in subparagraph (A) for the subsequent fiscal year.

(ii) Information relating to the use of the authority described in subparagraph (A) for the preceding year, including the following:

(I) The total amount expended.

(II) The number of covered dependents, covered employees, and covered individuals for whom payments were made.

(III) The amounts that were provided to each person described in subclause (II).

(iii) An assessment of whether additional authorities are required to ensure that covered dependents, covered employees, and covered individuals can receive payments for qualifying injuries, such as a qualifying injury to the back or heart.

(C) FORM.—The report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in classified form.

(2) REPORTS ON ESTIMATED COSTS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023.—Not later than March 1, 2022, the Secretary of State and each other agency head that makes a payment under subsection (i) of section 901 of title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b), as added by subsection (b) of this section, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report detailing an estimate of the obligation that the Director expects to incur in providing payment under such subsection (i) in fiscal year 2023.

(d) REGULATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and each other agency head that makes a payment under subsection (i)(2) of section 901 of title IX of division J of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (22 U.S.C. 2680b), as added by subsection (b) of this section, shall prescribe regulations required under subsection (i)(4)(A) of such Act.

(2) NOTICE TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 210 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the agency heads described in paragraph (1) shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees the regulations prescribed in accordance with paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on S. 1828.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1828, the HAVANA Act of 2021, and I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

America’s diplomats and intelligence professionals are the best in the world, dedicating their lives to public service to protect the American people and promote the interests of the United States.

As citizens, we are in their debt. As lawmakers, we also have a responsibility to protect their health and safety, making sure that they have the resources they need to do their jobs effectively and providing them with the necessary support if they are harmed in the line of duty.

That is why the HAVANA Act is such a critical piece of legislation. The incidents behind the so-called Havana syndrome are still under investigation and have affected American personnel at U.S. missions around the world, from Cuba, where the incidents first surfaced, and then reportedly to China, Europe, Central Asia, and even potentially here in Washington, D.C. It is imperative that the State Department, working in conjunction with the intelligence community, the Department of Defense, and other interagency partners and allies, get to the bottom of what caused these events, how best to deter them from happening in the future, and how best to protect our people.

While I am confident that the Biden administration is working hard to advance these investigations, Congress must also do its part, especially when it comes to helping those who have been directly impacted.

The HAVANA Act ensures that the United States’ diplomats and intelligence professionals are appropriately taken care of and compensated for injuries they incurred in connection with these events, fixing an important gap in existing law. I am very glad this important legislation will provide necessary supplemental funds to those who have been affected while in no way touching on any other benefits that come with Federal employment. This is a good, bipartisan measure, and I commend our Senate colleagues, especially Senators Collins and MARK WARNER, for sending it over to us in the House today.

The HAVANA Act, which the Senate unanimously passed, is the companion to legislation that Chairman ADAM SCHIFF introduced alongside Chairman GREGORY MEEKS. As the only Democratic Member who serves on both the

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I deeply appreciate the contributions and sacrifices of our diplomats and intelligence professionals who are working hard to defend our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the HAVANA Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1430

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, around the world, America and American personnel are being attacked in their homes, in hotels, and even on public streets. For most, it starts with what seems like a loud noise that is followed by pain or a sense of pressure in the head. Many are left with chronic damage, including hearing loss, vertigo, cognitive and motor impairment, severe headaches, and inability to sleep.

In the words of a recent press report, our diplomats are suffering a “concussion without a concussion.”

The Senate-passed bill before us today provides important authority to assist these brain injury victims, and it deserves our unanimous support. But we all must do more.

Unfortunately, these attacks have continued and spread. First, it started in Havana in late 2016 and spread to China in 2017. Two months ago, press reports described more than 130 possible cases all over the world, including right here in Washington, D.C. Just last week, two dozen new cases among U.S. personnel in Vienna were revealed. Simply put, this is kind of scary stuff.

The people who serve our Nation overseas are generally worried for themselves and their families, and they need to know that we have their backs. When the prior administration pulled our personnel out of Havana 4 years ago, they said: “Numerous Embassy Havana employees have been targeted in specific attacks. These employees have suffered significant injuries as a consequence of these attacks.”

In contrast, President Biden has refused to call these what they are, attacks on U.S. personnel. Secretary of State Tony Blinken publicly said perhaps no one is responsible for causing these injuries.

I will tell you, from my briefings and briefings in another annex, that is absolutely incorrect. We may not be able to fill in all the blanks yet, but we know too much to dismiss these attacks as unexplained health incidents.

Four years ago, medical experts convened by the State Department agreed victims were likely dealing with brain trauma from a nonnatural source, and the evidence has only grown more conclusive since then. Last year, the National Academy of Sciences said that directed, pulsed radio frequency energy is most likely the cause. According to the NAS, the situation raises grave concerns about bad actors who may have weapons.

While we must assist victims with today’s bill, we must do more. We must call these heinous attacks what they are. They are attacks, and the people attacking us need to know the consequences will be severe when we find out who they are and when we get the attribution. Otherwise, we aren’t doing what we can do to deter future attacks. The men and women who serve our Nation overseas deserve no less.

I have prepared a bill to do just that, which I will be introducing this week.

I thank Chairman MEEKS and our Intelligence Committee colleagues for their bipartisan work on the HAVANA Act, which I strongly support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF), the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

(Mr. SCHIFF asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the HAVANA Act.

I was proud to introduce this legislation in the House, and I appreciate the continued support from Ranking Member NUNES, Chairman MEEKS, and Ranking Member MCCAUL in moving this legislation through the House and to the President’s desk.

Every day, thousands of patriotic Americans serve our country abroad, representing our values and interests across the globe. They are diplomats, soldiers, intelligence officers, and more. But we must never forget they are also mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers, and sons and daughters who routinely make tremendous personal sacrifices in service of their country.

In return for their service to our Nation, we have a sacred responsibility to make sure that we take care of them. That is what this bill does.

Over the past several years, public servants from the intelligence community and elsewhere have experienced symptoms of unknown origins. These cases, which have been described as Havana syndrome or anomalous health incidents, named for the cohort whose symptoms onset in Havana, remain a mystery.

But two things are clear. First, we must spare no effort to identify their source and to hold anyone responsible accountable. Second, we must ensure that those who are injured receive the highest quality of care and the benefits that they need as they recover.

The HAVANA Act does just that. It would adjust and expand the authority we gave to the intelligence community and the State Department in 2019 to provide compensation for those experiencing these injuries to also include those suffering from traumatic brain injuries. Members of both parties have united behind this critical legislation to provide benefits to afflicted individuals.

Even as we pass this legislation, our work is not done. On a bipartisan basis, the Intelligence Committee has continued to provide vigorous oversight of how individuals experiencing these health incidents were treated and how they are being treated today. We will continue to prioritize this issue and put our people first.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues, Mr. CASTRO and Mr. MCCAUL, for their efforts.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), the ranking member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the coauthor of the House version of this bill.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for his work on this bill and my colleagues on the Senate side and the House side.

I rise in strong support of this legislation. When intelligence community officers risk their health and safety in service of their country, they need to know they will receive the full support of the United States Government if they are injured. That assurance is crucial for the officers’ ability to carry out their missions.

As the public now knows, our officers have been the victims of targeted attacks around the globe. I want to say upfront that these incidents are real, and the officers’ accounts are credible.

Victims have described the sudden onset of symptoms, such as intense head pressure, dizziness, vertigo, and cognitive difficulties. Some incidents have resulted in traumatic brain injuries, debilitating pain, and other serious health issues. Many victims continue to experience chronic health problems and require sustained treatment.

Over the past several months, we have been looking into these incidents. In my view, there are three objectives. The first is to determine the best way to help these officers and their families. The second is to find out who is perpetrating these attacks. The third is to conduct strong oversight of our agencies and make the necessary changes to achieve the first two objectives. That will require vigorous effort, but I am committed to uncovering the truth.

The bill we are considering today takes important steps to assist the victims of these attacks and ensure that our people will be compensated for their brain injuries. It builds on legislation we passed last Congress to improve worker’s compensation for certain personnel and their dependents.

Some have called the legislation technical, which it is, but it is, nevertheless, vital. Patriotic Americans serving to promote and protect our freedoms deserve our gratitude and full support.

The Senate has already passed this bill by unanimous consent. I fully support it, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I thank the chairman of the House Intelligence Committee and the ranking member, Mr. NUNES, for their strong support of this bill. It is very important.

I will be introducing a bill next week on this, and I hope to work with the House Intelligence Committee on that as well.

I am very concerned the administration may be planning to send U.S. personnel back to our Havana Embassy. I just got off of a big rally across the street from the White House with a lot of Cubans. They are searching for freedom and democracy over tyranny, oppression, and communism.

But our personnel, we can't send them back until we can say who or what caused these brain injuries that prompted the Trump administration to pull our people out of there for their own safety in 2017.

Over these last few weeks, the world has watched Cuba's brutal police state in action. The Venezuelan military is there as well, silencing people just for exercising freedom of speech, which they don't have under a communist dictatorship.

The same surveillance system that tracks dissidents and censors the internet has been unwilling to share necessary information about these attacks against Americans. I have no doubt that Cuban intelligence is involved in this.

If the administration sends U.S. personnel back to Havana without holding the regime accountable, all American diplomats are at risk.

Again, I support this bipartisan HAVANA Act. I urge my colleagues to support it as well. I think these men and women, both State Department diplomats and our intelligence officers, deserve better from our Nation. They need to receive the proper care that they deserve.

Again, I thank Chairman MEEKS and the Intelligence Committee, and I look forward to its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume for the purpose of closing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is imperative that we, as the elected representatives of the American people, working with the executive branch, get to the bottom of exactly who is behind these events, why they are occurring, and how to stop them.

But we must also make sure to do our part to take care of the public servants who put themselves on the line every day for our own interests.

I want to say thank you to the President, to the Secretary of State, and to the State Department for taking these cases seriously, for listening to the

families and all the trauma that they have gone through, and for showing them nothing but the utmost respect.

This bill is an excellent contribution to this effort, and I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis on this critical issue going forward.

I thank Chairman SCHIFF for his hard work, and I ask all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1828.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

SEPTEMBER 11TH NATIONAL MEMORIAL TRAIL ROUTE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2278) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate the September 11th National Memorial Trail, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2278

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SEPTEMBER 11TH NATIONAL MEMORIAL TRAIL ROUTE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “September 11th National Memorial Trail Route Proposed Trail Route,” numbered 669/176,670A, and dated July 2021.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

(3) TRAIL ROUTE.—The term “Trail Route” means the September 11th National Memorial Trail Route designated under subsection (b).

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRAIL ROUTE.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—There is designated a Trail Route, to be known as the “September 11th National Memorial Trail Route”, to link the National 9/11 Memorial and Museum in New York City, the National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial in Arlington, Virginia, and the Flight 93 National Memorial in Somerset County, Pennsylvania. The September 11th National Memorial Trail Route shall—

(A) provide for a tribute to the family members and loved ones who were victims of the attack and the heroes of September 11th, including the first responders in the days, weeks, and months after the attack;

(B) be a trail of remembrance to honor the fallen in a tangible way that keeps their memories alive and reaffirms the exceptionalism of our country; and

(C) be a celebration of our Nation's resilience and perseverance since September 11, 2001.

(2) ROUTE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Trail Route shall consist of a series of trails as generally depicted on the Map.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be available in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(C) REVISION.—The Secretary may revise the Map by publication in the Federal Register of a notice of availability of a new Map.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Trail Route program shall be administered by the Secretary in consultation with the affected landowners, including any Federal, State, Tribal or local agencies that manage the affected lands, but shall not be considered to be a unit of the National Park System or a part of the National Trail System.

(d) ACTIVITIES.—To facilitate the administration of the Trail Route program and the dissemination of information regarding the Trail Route, the Secretary shall—

(1) produce and disseminate appropriate educational materials regarding the Trail Route, such as handbooks, maps, exhibits, signs, interpretive guides, electronic information, and other interpretive materials;

(2) coordinate the management and planning of the Trail Route with participating property owners, other Federal agencies, State, Tribal, and local governments, and nonprofit entities;

(3) create and adopt an official, uniform symbol or device to mark the Trail Route;

(4) issue guidelines for the use of the symbol or device adopted under paragraph (3); and

(5) if deemed appropriate by the Secretary, authorize signage on lands managed by the General Services Administration or the National Park Service in the District of Columbia and its environs, without regard to the requirements of the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 8901).

(e) AGREEMENTS.—To ensure effective coordination of the Federal and non-Federal properties along the Trail Route, the Secretary may enter into agreements with, and provide technical and financial assistance to, other Federal agencies, the State, localities, regional governmental bodies, and private entities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2278, introduced by Representative GERRY CONNOLLY, would designate the September 11th National Memorial Trail Route to honor the family members and loved ones who were victims of that day's attack, as well as the heroes of September 11.

The route will consist of a series of trails and roadways linking the three

sites of the September 11 attack: the World Trade Center in New York; the Pentagon in Arlington, Virginia; and the Flight 93 Memorial near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

As we approach the 20th anniversary of this horrific act of terrorism, this bill would honor the memory of the nearly 3,000 Americans who lost their lives and would serve as a lasting reminder of the heroism and perseverance of our Nation's first responders.

I thank Representative CONNOLLY for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1445

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this year, as the gentlewoman pointed out, marks the 20th anniversary of the terrorist attacks of September 11. While almost two decades have passed since that tragic day, we will never forget the thousands of innocent people who lost their lives and the brave first responders who put their lives on the line in our country's time of need.

Memorials have been established nationwide to honor the victims and first responders who were killed in the attacks, including the National 9/11 Pentagon Memorial in Virginia, the Flight 93 National Memorial in Pennsylvania, and the National September 11 Memorial & Museum in New York.

H.R. 2278, offered by Congressman CONNOLLY, authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate a memorial trail, approximately 1,300 miles in length, to link the three existing September 11 memorials in Virginia, New York, and Pennsylvania. The tour route will intersect Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., and will be administered by the National Park Service.

This bill will help preserve the memory of the 2,977 innocent people who lost their lives on 9/11 and ensure that we never forget the horrors of that fateful day. I hope it also serves as some solace to the families of the victims, who can use this trail to remember and honor their lost loved ones.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), the author of this important piece of legislation.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, Congresswoman DINGELL, for her support, and the distinguished ranking member, the Republican manager, for his support.

In a troubled time, when we seem like we can't get together, here is an opportunity to come together, as we did 20 years ago on September 11.

I rise in support of H.R. 2278, designating the September 11th National

Memorial Trail Route, a 1,300-mile system of trails and roadways that connect all three sites attacked on September 11, 2001: The World Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon here in Washington, D.C., and the Flight 93 Memorial near Shanksville, Pennsylvania.

As our Nation prepares for the 20th anniversary of September 11, we have an opportunity to create a lasting legacy connecting all three sites.

The trail provides trail-goers with a chance to reflect and learn about our Nation's resilience and perseverance following that dreadful day.

In addition to the three 9/11 memorials anchoring this route, travelers can learn about our founding with stops at Valley Forge National Historical Park and Independence Hall in Philadelphia or visit the Antietam National Battlefield or the Gettysburg National Military Park to remember some of the other darkest days in our Nation's history.

This trail route connects travelers with these points in our history and majestic landscapes, while driving further tourism and recreation along its route.

It starts at the Pentagon Memorial in Arlington and extends northwest to the Shanksville site in Pennsylvania. It continues east to New York City's National September 11 Memorial & Museum. It then heads south, following the East Coast Greenway, connecting to the Garden of Reflection 9/11 Memorial. It then connects to the National Mall here in Washington, D.C., and ultimately returns to the Pentagon Memorial, remembering that dreadful incident at the Pentagon that cost so many lives.

It extends through six States and the District of Columbia. It is a multiuse trail, with more than 50 percent of the route off road. The idea for the trail was born in the wake of September 11 at the Mid-Atlantic Governors Conference on Greenways, Blueways, and Green Infrastructure.

Conference chair and then-director of the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation, David Brickley, presented the vision for a trail route connecting the Pentagon and the site of Flight 93 and the Twin Towers in New York City. David founded the September 11th National Memorial Trail Alliance in the following year to develop the September 11th National Memorial Trail.

This route would be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the affected landowners but would not be considered as a unit of the National Park System or as part of the National Trail System.

The Secretary would be authorized to produce and disseminate educational materials and create an official symbol or trail marker to mark the trail routes.

The bill authorizes the Secretary to enter into agreements with and provide technical and financial assistance to

other Federal agencies, States, localities, and private entities, as may be required.

Designating the September 11th National Memorial Trail route will serve as a natural embodiment of our pledge to never forget the heroes and the victims of that terrible day.

It honors the memories of nearly 3,000 family members and loved ones we lost on that day, and it is a tribute to the bravery of the heroes that responded.

When I was a local board of supervisors member, I was in a fire station, Fire Station 30, and I saw firsthand those first responders who went to the Pentagon to try to save lives, putting their own lives at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill gives anyone touched by the tragedy of 9/11 an opportunity for reflection, comfort, and healing. It is also a moment for us to come together once again to remember the heroes and the victims of that day, to honor them, and to come together as Republicans and Democrats in that pursuit.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2278, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

FREE VETERANS FROM FEES ACT

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1029) to Waive the application fee for any special use permit for veterans' special events at war memorials on land administered by the National Park Service in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1029

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Free Veterans from Fees Act".

SEC. 2. WAIVER OF SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION FEE FOR VETERANS' SPECIAL EVENTS.

(a) WAIVER.—The application fee for any special use permit solely for a veterans' special event at war memorials on land administered by the National Park Service in the

District of Columbia and its environs shall be waived.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND ITS ENVIRONS.—The term “the District of Columbia and its environs” has the meaning given that term in section 8902(a) of title 40, United States Code.

(2) GOLD STAR FAMILIES.—The term “Gold Star Families” includes any individual described in section 3.2 of Department of Defense Instruction 1348.36.

(3) SPECIAL EVENT.—The term “special events” has the meaning given that term in section 7.96 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) VETERAN.—The term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of title 38, United States Code.

(5) VETERANS’ SPECIAL EVENT.—The term “veterans’ special event” means a special event of which the majority of attendees are veterans or Gold Star Families.

(6) WAR MEMORIAL.—The term “war memorial” means any memorial or monument which has been erected or dedicated to commemorate a military unit, military group, war, conflict, victory, or peace.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply to any special use permit application submitted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF EXISTING LAWS.—Permit applicants remain subject to all other laws, regulations, and policies regarding the application, issuance and execution of special use permits for a veterans’ special event at war memorials on land administered by the National Park Service in the District of Columbia and its environs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1029, the Free Veterans from Fees Act, introduced by my colleague, Representative GREG STEUBE.

This bill would honor the sacrifices made by our veterans and Gold Star families by waiving application fees for veterans’ special events at war memorials on land administered by the National Park Service in our Nation’s Capital.

Although the National Park Service has a longstanding practice of waiving application fees for special use permits for most veterans’ events at war memorials, veterans’ organizations have often had to pay administrative fees and associated costs to obtain permits for events, such as honor buses.

By codifying a version of this practice in law, we can ensure that vet-

erans and the Gold Star families are not required to pay when visiting the national war memorials that were built to commemorate their bravery and sacrifices and our country’s fallen heroes.

I would like to thank Representative STEUBE for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1029, offered by Congressman STEUBE of Florida, would waive the application fee associated with special use permits for any veterans’ demonstrations or special events at war memorials located on Federal land.

Each year, hundreds of veterans’ groups and Gold Star families visit our national war memorials in Washington, D.C. This is done through arranged visits sponsored by veterans’ organizations. To obtain a permit for any special events they hold, these veterans’ groups may be required to pay administrative fees and other processing costs to the National Park Service. The Free Veterans from Fees Act waives these special use permit fees for veterans’ groups so that they may hold their demonstrations and special events at war memorials administered by the National Park Service in the District of Columbia free of charge.

The last thing veterans and their families should worry about is paying administrative fees when visiting memorials and monuments built in their honor. These brave men and women fought to defend our Nation, and we should honor their sacrifices by making it as simple as possible for them to visit these sites.

I commend Congressman STEUBE for his work on this bill, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I was an original cosponsor with my good friend and colleague, Mr. STEUBE from Florida, of H.R. 1029, the Free Veterans from Fees Act.

H.R. 1029 would waive application fees for special use permits for Honor Flights and Gold Star Family events and other veterans demonstrations and special events at our Nation’s war memorials. It is the right thing to do, to try to reduce the cost for a lot of these important commemorative occasions happening right here in our Nation’s Capital.

Throughout the years, I have had the privilege of being able to attend many of the Freedom Honor Flights that emanated from my hometown in La Crosse, Wisconsin. They are joyous occasions, with much celebration hon-

oring the service and sacrifice of our veterans, celebrating their achievements, but more importantly, allowing them, many for the very last time, to be able to hop on a plane, come to Washington, and pay their respects at the memorials of conflicts that they were involved in and for the fallen comrades who didn’t come home.

Oftentimes, on the way home—I know this is true for our La Crosse Honor Flights—there is a mail call where the relatives of these veterans, family members, write letters of thanks to them as they are coming home. When they arrive, it is a huge celebration of music and thanking them for their service and sacrifice. It is a great thing to behold.

The thought that the cost of this is compounded with unnecessary application fees in order to attend these events at our war memorials is something we can rectify, and that is exactly what we are doing under H.R. 1029, along with Gold Star events that occur here and other veterans’ events.

I also am the original author of the Veterans History Project, trying to record our veterans’ stories before they pass away, archiving it at the Library of Congress, so that we never forget the service and sacrifice that came before us.

We are trying to capture many of these veterans coming to our Nation’s Capital—again, many for the very last time—to have them share their story of what it was like to serve our country during times of conflict and peace. So it has been a great avenue in order to reach out and expand the number of oral histories that we have collected at the Library of Congress, close to 120,000 veterans’ stories so far and counting.

So if this is a way for us to reduce cost, to ease the burden, to make it easier for veterans to come here, a chance for us to reach out to them, asking them to share their memories of what it was like to serve our Nation, then that is a good thing for us to do.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1029, and I thank my colleague from Florida (Mr. STEUBE) for partnering with me on this legislation.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a great bill to honor our heroes and to say thank you in another way. I urge a “yes” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1500

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, we have heard all the reasons why this bill matters. We even did an Honor Flight with the Rosies from Michigan, which was memorable.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1029.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

GREAT DISMAL SWAMP NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1154) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1154

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **HERITAGE AREA.**—The term "Heritage Area" means the Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) **STATES.**—The term "States" means the States of Virginia and North Carolina.

(4) **STUDY AREA.**—The term "study area" means—

(A) the cities of Chesapeake, Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Suffolk in the State of Virginia;

(B) Isle of Wight County in the State of Virginia;

(C) Camden, Currituck, Gates, and Pasquotank counties in the State of North Carolina; and

(D) any other areas in the States that—

(i) have heritage aspects that are similar to the areas described in subparagraphs (A), (B), or (C); and

(ii) are adjacent to, or in the vicinity of, those areas.

SEC. 3. STUDY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, in consultation with State and local organizations and governmental agencies, Tribal governments, non-profit organizations, and other appropriate entities, shall conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating the study area as a National Heritage Area, to be known as the "Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area".

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The study shall include analysis, documentation, and determinations on whether the study area—

(1) has an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that—

(A) represent distinctive aspects of the people and cultures of the United States;

(B) are worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use; and

(C) would be best managed—

(i) through partnerships among public and private entities; and

(ii) by linking diverse and sometimes non-contiguous resources and active communities;

(2) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and folklore that are a valuable part of the story of the United States;

(3) provides outstanding opportunities—

(A) to conserve natural, historic, cultural, or scenic features; and

(B) for recreation and education;

(4) contains resources that—

(A) are important to any identified themes of the study area; and

(B) retain a degree of integrity capable of supporting interpretation;

(5) includes residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and State, local, and Tribal governments, and other appropriate entities that—

(A) are involved in the planning of the Heritage Area;

(B) have developed a conceptual financial plan that outlines the roles of all participants in the Heritage Area, including the Federal Government; and

(C) have demonstrated support for the designation of the Heritage Area;

(6) has a potential management entity to work in partnership with the individuals and entities described in paragraph (5) to develop the Heritage Area while encouraging State and local economic activity; and

(7) has a conceptual boundary map that is supported by the public.

SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to carry out this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report that describes—

(1) the findings of the study under section 3; and

(2) any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1154, the Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area Act, introduced by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN), my Natural Resources Committee colleague.

This bill would direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study assessing the suitability and the feasibility of designating the Great Dismal Swamp in the States of Virginia and North Carolina as a national heritage area.

The Great Dismal Swamp is an area of great historical, cultural, and environmental importance, and has been home to indigenous people since time immemorial. The swamp includes the ancestral lands of the Nansemond Indian Nation and the historic lands of the Haliwa-Saponi and Meherrin tribes.

The swamp was also one of the only known water-based stops on the Under-

ground Railroad and home to a thriving community descending from early colonial free people of color whose families resisted American slavery by finding refuge within the swamp.

In 1974 the swamp was designated as a national wildlife refuge due to its ecological significance, and today it holds the largest intact remnant of a vast forest that once covered more than a million acres.

Designating the Great Dismal Swamp as a national heritage area will help share the often untold stories of some of our Nation's underrepresented communities.

From the indigenous communities who first called the swamp home to the enslaved African Americans who endured the swamp's hardships in their fight for freedom, these are stories worth sharing with current and future generations.

I would like to thank my friend and colleague, Representative MCEACHIN, for championing this important legislation. I urge all my colleagues to support this bill. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1154, offered by Congressman MCEACHIN, requires the Secretary of the Interior to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating a national heritage area comprised of cities and counties in Virginia and counties in North Carolina to be known as the Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area.

While many think of Washington, D.C. as a great dismal swamp, it is actually a marshy region on the coastal plain of southeastern Virginia and northeastern North Carolina that stretches roughly 37 miles north to south and covers an area approximately 750 square miles. The Great Dismal Swamp has a long history of Native American inhabitants and was a known route and destination for freedom seekers.

This measure already passed the House as an amendment to H.R. 803, the Protecting America's Wilderness and Public Lands Act earlier this Congress. I did not support the measure then because it had not gone through regular order and was being added to a package that created 1.5 million acres of new wilderness. You could say this measure was bogged down here in the swamp.

While this is not how the process should work, I am happy that this bill has now gone through regular order, and I would, therefore, urge adoption of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation. I am glad that my colleague's thoughts came through the swamp, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1154.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1664) to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1664

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation may establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs to honor the extraordinary acts of valor, selfless service, and sacrifice displayed by Medal of Honor recipients.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the commemorative work under this section shall be in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”).

(c) PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work under this section.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NATIONAL MEDAL OF HONOR MUSEUM FOUNDATION.—The National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the commemorative work under this section.

(d) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If, on payment of all expenses for the establishment of the commemorative work under this section (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Interior for deposit in the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of that title.

(2) ON EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—If, on expiration of the authority for the commemorative work under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the

commemorative work under this section, the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation for memorials, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator of General Services, as appropriate, in accordance with the process provided in paragraph (4) of section 8906(b) of that title for accounts established under paragraph (2) or (3) of that section.

SEC. 2. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1664, introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), would authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a monument in the District of Columbia commemorating the extraordinary acts of valor, selfless service, and sacrifice displayed by the Medal of Honor recipients.

The Medal of Honor is our country's highest military decoration, and since its creation during the Civil War, the medal has been awarded to more than 3,500 members of the armed services.

This bill would honor the unparalleled bravery and sacrifices of Medal of Honor recipients and ensure that the medal's values of courage, sacrifice, patriotism, citizenship, integrity, and commitment are shared for generations to come.

I would like to thank Representative VEASEY for his leadership on this important legislation and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1664, offered by Congressman VEASEY, would authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the D.C. area to recognize Medal of Honor recipients.

The Medal of Honor is our Nation's highest medal for valor in combat awarded to members of the U.S. Armed Forces. The medal was first authorized in 1861 for U.S. Navy sailors and marines, and the following year for Army soldiers. Since then more than 3,500 Medals of Honor have been awarded to members of all Department of Defense services and the Coast Guard. Medals of Honor are awarded sparingly and only bestowed on the bravest of the brave whose courage and valor in combat is well documented.

According to the Congressional Medal of Honor Society, at least 10 Arkansans have been awarded the Medal of Honor since its inception. This includes John Henry Pruitt, an Arkansan who is one of only 19 soldiers to ever be awarded the Medal of Honor twice. Our State Capitol in Little Rock also boasts its own Medal of Honor Memorial, which depicts a bronze eagle surrounded by plaques honoring each individual Medal of Honor recipient from Arkansas.

I would like to thank Congressman VEASEY and Congressman BLAKE MOORE of Utah, a freshman on our committee, for their leadership on this important bipartisan bill. I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY).

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to urge my colleagues to pass the National Medal of Honor Monument Act. This is bipartisan legislation, as was mentioned, that I introduced with Representative MOORE of Utah.

This bill honors our Nation's brave servicemembers by paving the way for the creation of a monument in our Nation's Capital recognizing the Medal of Honor and its more than 3,500 recipients.

Our Nation's Medal of Honor recipients are patriots. They have put their lives on the line to ensure we can live freely and prosperously in the greatest nation on Earth. That is why I am happy to have spearheaded this from the beginning and pay homage to the values the Medal of Honor represents—courage, patriotism, citizenship, integrity, commitment, and sacrifice—and the brave individuals who earned it in service to our country.

The National Medal of Honor Museum will actually open in my district in Arlington, Texas, in the next few years, and it will also serve as a beacon for these values.

My hope is that we are able to pass this legislation to honor these individuals because this is a very, very prestigious award for our Nation's veterans and for those that have sacrificed. We want to make sure that we do everything we can to rally around this and honor the bravest individuals who serve in our country by having a monument here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill and strongly

support creating this memorial, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague said it well. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1664, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS FAMILY MONUMENT EXTENSION ACT

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2365) to extend the authority for the establishment of a commemorative work in honor of Gold Star Families, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2365

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Gold Star Mothers Family Monument Extension Act”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMEMORATIVE WORK.

Notwithstanding section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, the authority provided by section 2859 of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 126 Stat. 2164; 40 U.S.C. 8903 note) shall continue to apply through January 2, 2027.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2365, introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM), would extend the authorization for the establishment of a commemorative work to Gold Star Mother Families until January 2, 2027.

The Gold Star Mothers Family National Monument would honor the mothers and families of those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice in service of our Nation.

The Gold Star is a widely recognized tradition that dates back to World War I when families would display service flags bearing a blue star for each family member serving abroad and a gold star for each family member who had been lost in combat.

Although this commemorative work was originally authorized in the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2013, the authorization expired in January 2020. In November 2015, the U.S. Commission of Fine Arts approved a location for the memorial on the National Park Service property west of the Arlington National Cemetery visitor center.

□ 1515

Following that approval, the National Capital Memorial Advisory Commission has engaged in consultation with the Gold Star Mothers National Monument Foundation regarding the memorial's design.

This bill would build on these efforts by extending the authorization needed to establish the monument. While we can never truly repay the debt that America owes to our Gold Star Mothers and their families, H.R. 2365 would bring us closer toward fully honoring the sacrifices that they have made.

I would like to thank Representative KIM for introducing this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2365, offered by Congressman KIM, would extend the authorization of the Gold Stars Mothers National Monument Foundation to construct the Gold Star National Mothers Monument. Legislation signed into law during the 112th Congress authorized the Gold Star Mothers National Monument Foundation to erect a monument on Federal lands in Washington, D.C., that would honor mothers whose children gave the last full measure of devotion defending the United States as members of the Armed Forces.

This bill would allow more time for the Foundation to ensure the monument's construction and completion by extending the authorization until January 2, 2027.

We can never fully understand the lifelong grief that these Gold Star Mothers must face, and I hope that this new memorial serves as a collective place for them to heal and remember their brave children who valiantly fought to defend our country.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and the Gold Star families, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2365, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

AMACHE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2497) to establish the Amache National Historic Site in the State of Colorado as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2497

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Amache National Historic Site Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) MAP.—The term “Map” means the map entitled “Amache National Historical Site Proposed Boundary”, numbered 100/175348 and dated July 2021.

(2) NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.—The term “National Historic Site” means the Amache National Historic Site established by section 3(a).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. AMACHE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to subsection (c), there is established the Amache National Historic Site in the State of Colorado as a unit of the National Park System.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the National Historic Site is to preserve, protect, and interpret for the benefit of present and future generations resources associated with—

(1) the incarceration of civilians of Japanese ancestry during World War II at Amache, also known as the Granada Relocation Center, and the military service of center internees;

(2) public reaction in the State of Colorado to the incarceration of Japanese Americans, including the position of Governor Ralph Carr and the local community; and

(3) the transition of the internees and their descendants following the closure of the center

and resettlement in the State of Colorado and other States.

(c) **DETERMINATION BY THE SECRETARY.**—The National Historic Site shall not be established until the date on which the Secretary determines that a sufficient quantity of land or interests in land has been acquired to constitute a manageable park unit.

(d) **NOTICE.**—Not later than 30 days after the Secretary makes a determination under subsection (c), the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register notice of the establishment of the National Historic Site.

(e) **BOUNDARY; MAP.**—

(1) **BOUNDARY.**—The boundary of the National Historic Site shall be as generally depicted on the Map.

(2) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—The Map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(f) **LAND ACQUISITION AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary may acquire any land or interests in land located within the boundary of the Camp Amache National Historic Landmark, as generally depicted on the Map, by—

(1) donation;

(2) purchase from a willing seller with donated or appropriated Funds; or

(3) exchange.

(g) **ADDITION TO BOUNDARY.**—Any lands or interests in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be included within the boundary of the National Historic Site.

(h) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall administer the National Historic Site in accordance with—

(A) this Act; and

(B) the laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System.

(2) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(A) **DEADLINE FOR COMPLETION.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available to the Secretary for this purpose, the Secretary shall prepare a general management plan for the National Historic Site in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

(B) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—On completion of the general management plan under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives the general management plan prepared under that subparagraph.

(i) **ADMINISTRATIVE FACILITIES.**—For the purposes of ensuring the preservation, protection, and proper management of the site and associated resources, the Secretary may establish facilities for administration, visitor services, and curation of personal property, outside the boundary of, and in the vicinity of, the National Historic Site.

(j) **COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—The Secretary may enter into agreements with—

(1) the public or private entities for the purpose of establishing and operating facilities outside of the boundary of the National Historic Site for administration, visitor services and curation of personal property; and

(2) other public or private entities for the purposes of carrying out this Act.

(k) **EFFECT ON WATER RIGHTS.**—Except as provided for in subsection (l), nothing in this Act shall affect—

(1) the use, allocation, ownership, or control, in existence on the date of the enactment of any water, water right, or any other valid existing right;

(2) any vested absolute or decreed conditional water right in existence on the date of the enactment;

(3) any interstate water compact in existence on the date of the enactment; or

(4) State jurisdiction over any water law.

(l) **OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF WATER INFRASTRUCTURE AND APPURTENANCES.**—

(1) The town of Granada, Colorado, shall maintain responsibility for the operation and maintenance of all water infrastructure, systems and appurtenances located within the boundary of the National Historic Site in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including but not limited to wells, pumps, tanks, water lines, valves, and water treatment facilities.

(2) The Secretary shall provide the town of Granada, Colorado, with access to those areas of the National Historic Site determined as necessary for the operation and maintenance of water infrastructure and appurtenances.

(3) The Secretary may permit the city of Granada, Colorado, to construct or install new water infrastructure, systems and appurtenances consistent with applicable laws, limited only to those areas determined in subsection (i)(2), and in a manner that ensures the preservation, protection, and proper management of the National Historic Site.

(4) At such time that all water infrastructure, systems and appurtenances located within the boundary of the National Historic Site are no longer utilized by the city of Granada, Colorado, associated improvements and associated water rights may be acquired through donation to and made part of the National Historic Site in a condition satisfactory to the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2497, the Amache National Historic Site Act, introduced by the chair of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, my colleague from Colorado, Representative JOE NEGUSE.

H.R. 2497 would establish the Amache imprisonment site in southeast Colorado as a national historic site to ensure permanent protections and provide for the interpretation of the Amache site of Japanese-American incarceration.

Following the United States' entry into World War II, President Franklin D. Roosevelt issued an executive order forcibly removing more than 120,000 people, primarily of Japanese descent, to 10 remote military-style prisons across the Nation.

The Granada Relocation Center, commonly known as Amache, was one of those 10 centers and was the only one located in the State of Colorado. Although Amache was the smallest of the relocation centers, it became the tenth largest city in Colorado with more than 10,000 people passing through the camp between 1942 and 1945, nearly two-thirds of whom were American citizens.

Most had never been to Japan and most were given a week or less to leave their homes and dispose of everything they owned, everything they had worked hard to build up for themselves. This unjustifiable, horrific, and unconstitutional incarceration of Japanese Americans is, without doubt, one of the darkest chapters in our country's history.

And while these incarceration sites no longer hold prisoners, many of the wrongfully imprisoned are still with us today, even as anti-Asian rhetoric continues to permeate our country. As we continue to reckon with our Nation's painful legacy of systemic racism, it is critical that we honor and share the stories of those who came before us. It is vital that we remember and learn from their fights against injustice and for equity.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2497, and join me in working to ensure that we remember this dark time in our Nation's history so we may honor those who lived it, share their stories, and continue to heal as a country. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2497, offered by my friend, Representative NEGUSE from Colorado, would establish the Amache National Historic Site in Colorado as a unit of the National Park System.

In 1942, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt issued an executive order, later enforced by law, to forcibly remove tens of thousands of Japanese Americans, including nearly 70,000 American citizens, from the West Coast to internment centers further inland during World War II. The smallest internment camp was located a mile from Granada, Colorado, and was officially known as Amache. Over 7,000 residents of Japanese ancestry, most of them American citizens, were imprisoned at Amache from 1942 to 1945. The Amache site was added to the National Register of Historic Places in 1994 and designated a National Historic Landmark in 2005.

Amache is currently owned by the town of Granada, Colorado, and maintained by a group of student volunteers who, led by their high school social studies teacher, are known as the Amache Preservation Society.

During a hearing on the bill in the Natural Resources Committee earlier this year, we heard testimony from an Amache survivor, Mr. Bob Fuchigami. Mr. Fuchigami was just 11 when his family was forcibly relocated to Amache and during his powerful testimony, he said the following about the bill: "Designating Amache a national park site would shine a light on our forgotten history and help tell a more complete story of America. Amache is our collective story. It is an American story."

Adding the Amache site to the National Park System will help educate Americans about this dark chapter in

our Nation's history and help us not to repeat the mistakes of our past. Sites like Amache help to remind us of the challenges our Nation has faced and the mistakes we have made as we have endeavored to form a more perfect Union.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill so that in Mr. Fuchigami's own words we can "help shine a light on this forgotten history."

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2497, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

ALEXANDER LOFGREN VETERANS IN PARKS (VIP) ACT

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4300) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make free National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Passes available to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 4300

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Alexander Lofgren Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act".

SEC. 2. RECREATION PASSES.

Section 805 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (Public Law 108-447; 118 Stat. 3385; 16 U.S.C. 6804) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(4), by striking "age and disability discounted" and inserting "age discount and lifetime"; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the heading, by striking "DISCOUNTED" and inserting "FREE AND DISCOUNTED";

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking "DISABILITY DISCOUNT" and inserting "LIFETIME PASSES"; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(B) Any veteran who provides adequate proof of military service as determined by the Secretary.

"(C) Any member of a Gold Star Family who meets the eligibility requirements of section 3.2 of Department of Defense Instruc-

tion 1348.36 (or a successor instruction)."; and

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in the heading, by striking "GOLD STAR FAMILIES PARKS PASS" and inserting "ANNUAL PASSES"; and

(ii) by striking "members of" and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting "members of the Armed Forces and their dependents who provide adequate proof of eligibility for such pass as determined by the Secretary.".

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4300, the Alexander Lofgren Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act introduced by my colleague Representative MILLER-MEEKS from Iowa.

This bill would provide free annual America the Beautiful Passes to current military servicemembers and free lifetime America the Beautiful Passes to veterans and members of Gold Star families, ensuring that those who have sacrificed so much in the service of our Nation are able to access our national parks and public lands at no cost.

Anyone who has visited America's public lands understands the significant mental and physical health benefits of getting outside and connecting with nature. It is time that we ensure our military servicemembers, veterans, and Gold Star families are able to access these beloved places at no cost.

Although the annual America the Beautiful Pass became free for veterans and Gold Star families in 2020, the change for veterans has never been codified in law.

While we will never be able to repay the debt owed to them for their service and their sacrifice, H.R. 4300 will ensure that this benefit is protected in perpetuity and that all of our American heroes are able to recreate and find comfort and solace on the lands that they fought so hard to protect.

I would like to thank Representative MILLER-MEEKS for her service and for her work on this important legislation, including working with Committee on Natural Resources chair, Mr. GRIJALVA, to rename the bill in honor of Alexander Lofgren.

Alexander Lofgren served for 4 years in the U.S. Army as a combat engineer, including a deployment to Afghanistan. Afterwards, he served in Chair GRIJALVA's office as part of the Wounded Warrior Fellowship Program, handling issues and constituent casework concerning veterans' health and benefits.

As a congressional staffer and veteran, Mr. Lofgren was a great proponent for his community, veterans, and our Nation's public lands, often encouraging returning veterans to reconnect with nature to heal.

Tragically, his life was lost during a recent outing in Death Valley National Park. Our hearts go out to his family. Renaming this legislation after Mr. Lofgren is a fitting tribute to his legacy and service to our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to speak today in support of H.R. 4300, the Alexander Lofgren Veterans in Parks Act, also known as the VIP Act, which is sponsored by Congresswoman MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS from Iowa.

This bipartisan bill, which currently has 150 cosponsors, would provide free annual passes to our national parks and public lands for current military servicemembers and free lifetime passes for veterans and members of Gold Star families.

We can never fully repay the debt owed to our military servicemembers, veterans, and Gold Star families. However, as a small acknowledgment of their sacrifice, this bill will ensure that they can always access over 2,000 Federal recreation areas across the country that they fought so hard to defend free of charge.

□ 1530

By codifying these passes under the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act, it guarantees this benefit can never be taken away from these brave men and women.

This bill is important not only because it honors the sacrifice of the men and women of our military and Gold Star families but because our public lands hold a special value for veterans, particularly those wounded in combat.

Captain John Paluska, a constituent of Representative MILLER-MEEKS and a Purple Heart recipient, summed up the purpose and meaning of this bill perfectly when he testified before our committee earlier this month: "I mentioned the word 'freedom' earlier. Is it a concept? Is it a place? Is it the result of an action? What does it mean for

each of you on this committee? For me, it is all of those, and I find this each and every time I am so very fortunate to visit the outdoors and our national parks.”

This bill would not only allow our veterans and Gold Star family members to always enjoy the freedom of our national parks, but it will remove any financial barriers they may face to accessing places they use to heal the emotional and physical burdens they carry with them.

In addition to the 150 bipartisan cosponsors of this bill, there are also 60 organizations currently endorsing the measure. These organizations represent a diverse variety of interests, from the outdoor recreation industry to veterans groups, and include The American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Paralyzed Veterans of America, Outdoor Recreation Roundtable, REI, Vista Outdoor, Audubon Society, and The Nature Conservancy.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD five letters in support of the bill from the Outdoor Industry Association, Sierra Club, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, American Cultural Resources Association, and Evangelical Environmental Network.

OUTDOOR INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION,
July 9, 2021.

Hon. JOE NEGUSE,
Chairman, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, Washington, DC.

Hon. RUSS FULCHER,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEGUSE AND RANKING MEMBER FULCHER, On behalf of our 1,200 manufacturer, supplier, sales representative and retailer members, Outdoor Industry Association (OIA) is proud to support the “Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act” to give veterans and members of the Armed Forces free access to national parks and public lands.

Spending time in nature can provide countless mental and physical health benefits for everyone, including our nation’s servicemembers. Through studies and anecdotes, we know outdoor activities are linked to improved mental health and long-term psychological well-being. Additionally, increasing access and opportunity to outdoor spaces is an important way to honor those who have risked their lives to protect us and this country.

The outdoors can be a restorative force for all, helping individuals and communities thrive. We are pleased to see the commitment to ensuring those who served our country have the resources they need to participate in outdoor activities and experience everything our beautiful national parks and public lands have to offer. OIA is committed to honoring and respecting servicemembers through access to the outdoors and outdoor recreation, and we look forward to seeing this bill become law.

Sincerely,

LISE AANGENBRUG,
Executive Director, Outdoor Industry Association.

JULY 13, 2021.

Hon. JOE NEGUSE,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, Washington, DC.

Hon. RUSS FULCHER,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Federal Lands, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NEGUSE, RANKING MEMBER FULCHER, AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS, AND PUBLIC LANDS: On behalf of 3.8 million members and supporters, the Sierra Club urges you to support the Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act, H.R. 4300. This bipartisan legislation would help military service members, veterans, and Gold Star Families explore, enjoy, and heal on America’s public lands and waters by removing a financial barrier to access over 2,000 federal recreation areas.

America’s public lands and waters provide unique opportunities for healing and respite for veterans upon returning home from service. Unfortunately, these opportunities are not equally available to all. No one, especially veterans, active duty service members, and Gold Star Families, should be denied access to the benefits of nature because of a lack of funds. The Veterans in Parks Act will ensure that those who have served and sacrificed for our nation can enjoy a direct connection to the land they defend.

Many veterans face considerable challenges upon returning home. Repeat exposure to trauma and long deployments away from family and friends has resulted in a generation of veterans that have difficulty reintegrating into civilian life. In addition, some of the effects of war, such as traumatic brain injury and post-traumatic stress, leave no visible scars and can be equally or more disabling than an apparent physical injury, making it even harder to adjust to life at home. As a result, the demand for mental health services for veterans continues to grow. According to the U.S. Government Accountability Office, the number of veterans receiving mental health care from the Department of Veterans Affairs increased 90% from FY 2006–2019—more than three times the rate of increase for all VA health care services. During this time, VA’s mental health budget increased from \$2.4 to \$8.9 billion.

Time spent outdoors is proven to promote mental and physical health and well-being. For veterans, these benefits can be exceptionally profound; research into the efficacy of outdoor recreation as therapy shows significant improvements in mental and physical well-being, social function, and outlook on life with even moderate exposure to nature. Research also indicates that these programs may be especially beneficial to veterans most in need of help, supplemented by fewer stigmas being associated with outdoor recreation compared to clinical treatments. Expanding access to these benefits is a common-sense, cost-effective way to ease veterans’ transition into civilian life and improve the health and wellbeing of service members and Gold Star Families.

Veterans are already relying on the healing power of the outdoors. Structured programs utilizing outdoor recreation on federal lands have become increasingly common within various Veterans Service Organizations.

Last year, Congress passed the Accelerating Veterans Recovery Outdoors Act, which will create an interagency task force to identify veterans’ barriers to access and recommend how the Department of Veterans Affairs can utilize public lands as an adjunct therapy for veterans. This victory was a critical step to ensure veterans have ample op-

portunities to enjoy outdoor recreation on the land they served to protect. Similarly, the Veterans in Parks Act will be an important part of fulfilling that mission and improving the lives of veterans, service members, and Gold Star Families.

Thank you for your support for our nation’s service members, veterans, and Gold Star Families.

Sincerely,

ROB VESSELS,
Military Outdoors Campaign Manager, Sierra Club.

BACKCOUNTRY HUNTERS & ANGLERS,
July 8, 2021.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,
Chair, House Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Ranking Member, House Natural Resources Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR GRIJALVA AND RANKING MEMBER WESTERMAN: On behalf of Backcountry Hunters & Anglers (BHA), the voice for our wild public lands, waters and wildlife, we write in support of the bipartisan Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act (H.R. 4300) led by Representatives Miller-Meeke (R-IA) and Gallego (D-AZ). This important legislation will provide free annual America the Beautiful Passes to current military service members and free lifetime America the Beautiful Passes to veterans and members of Gold Star Families.

We recognize that members of the armed forces are a critical constituency when it comes to the defense of our wild public lands. BHA’s Armed Forces Initiative focuses on connecting veterans to our public lands through lowering the barrier of entry of hunting and fishing for military members, engaging veterans through skill camps and leading restoration projects, and elevating the voices of veterans from town halls to the discussion of legislation at the congressional level. The benefits provided by the VIP Act would fit well within this mission.

The VIP Act is supported by hunters and anglers who want to recognize the sacrifice made by service members, veterans and Gold Star Families. The debt to these individuals can never be repaid, but the VIP Act would give them access, at no cost, to over 2,000 federal recreation areas including national parks, national forests and national wildlife refuges. This will eliminate barriers and increase access to hunt, fish and recreate on our nation’s treasured public lands, an honor they deserve.

Since 2020, the annual America the Beautiful Pass has been free for veterans and Gold Star Families, however the VIP Act would change these to lifetime passes and codify this program to ensure it continues in the years to come. Passing this legislation would not only ensure this program continues for veterans and Gold Star Families, but it would also provide the much-needed inclusion for current service members.

We urge the Natural Resources Committee to pass the VIP Act and honor the service of our nation’s active-duty military, veterans and Gold Star Families by increasing their access to our public lands and waters. As the bill continues through the legislative process, we look forward to working with you and your colleagues to see it across the finish line.

Sincerely,

MORGAN MASON,
Armed Forces Initiative Coordinator, Backcountry Hunters & Anglers.

AMERICAN CULTURAL
RESOURCES ASSOCIATION,
July 12, 2021.

Hon. MARIANNETTE MILLER-MEEKS,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RUBEN GALLEGO,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES MILLER-MEEKS AND GALLEGO: The American Cultural Resources Association (ACRA) strongly supports H.R. 4300, the Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act, and commends you for introducing this worthy legislation.

ACRA is the national trade association supporting the common interests of cultural resource management (CRM) firms of all sizes, types, and specialties. ACRA member firms undertake much of the legally mandated cultural resource studies and investigations in the United States. They employ thousands of professionals, including archaeologists, architectural historians, historians, ethnographers, and an increasingly diverse group of other specialists who work with communities in every state to help protect and record our nation's historic and cultural heritage.

Our nation's public lands, monuments and parks help tell the story of America, from the battlefields of Yorktown to the Pacific coast and everything in between. These public lands educate, entertain and inspire millions of Americans and visitors from around the world. They are integral to understanding America's history and culture, while providing enormous ecological benefits to our nation's ecosystem.

As veterans, you both understand firsthand the enormous sacrifices that servicemembers and their families have made to protect our nation. Their contributions to our nation's story are incalculable; they certainly should not have to pay to access to our most treasured and beautiful public lands.

By giving active-duty servicemembers free annual passes, and veterans and Gold Star Families free lifetime passes, to our national parks and lands, the VIP Act honors both our nation's historic and scenic heritage and the people who have sacrificed so much to protect it.

We commend you for your leadership in introducing this bipartisan bill, and we urge Congress to pass it as soon as possible.

Sincerely,

NATHAN BOYLESS,
President,
American Cultural Resources Association.

EVANGELICAL ENVIRONMENTAL
NETWORK,
July 12, 2021.

Ref: H.R. 4300—117th Congress (2021–2022)

Hon. JOE NEGUSE, *Chair*,

Hon. RUSS FULCHER, *Ranking Member*,
*Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and
Public Lands, Committee on Natural Resources*,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIR NEGUSE AND RANKING MEMBER FULCHER, Our National Parks and other public lands are essential to our quality of life. They make God's creation available to everyone. They reflect our ideals as a nation: that everyone is welcome because all individuals are created equal and endowed with the inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To step into a National Park and enjoy the beauty of God's creation is to experience freedom and the richness of life as persons made in the image of God. That's why over 400,000 pro-life Christians have joined with us to defend and protect these God-given National Treasures.

Most Christians have experienced God in our natural parks and public lands, but we also have the responsibility to care for them.

We are commanded to tend the earth and steward all aspects of this wonderful creation given to us to sustain abundant physical life, enjoy, and even play in. Creation doesn't belong to any one person or group to exploit, plunder, or be used selfishly. It's a trust, given by God, for the benefit of humanity and the glory of God.

That is why The Evangelical Environmental Network supports the efforts of Representative Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA), Representative Ruben Gallego (D-AZ), and the over 140 other cosponsors for introducing the Veterans in Park (VIP) Act! The VIP Act offers a small thank you to our military service members, veterans, and Gold Star Families for their patriotism and service to our nation, but it goes beyond saying thanks, it offers an opportunity for healing. Medical research clearly proves the ability to find healing in our greatest outdoor treasures, America's National Parks. God's marvelous creation provides perhaps the greatest healing place for many of our heroes and their families who suffer deep internal wounds. The VIP Act offers our heroes hope for healing, wholeness, restoration, and simply great fun!

Our prayer is that the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands will quickly move this to the full committee and then onward to the House floor in quick order.

Thank you for your service to our nation and know you are in our prayers.

Sincerely,

THE REV. MITCHELL C. HESCOX,
President/C.E.O.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD several news articles that speak to the importance of this bill that have appeared in papers all across the country.

HONORING AMERICA'S REAL VIPs

(By Reps. Bruce Westerman (R-ARK.) and Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IOWA), Opinion Contributors)

[From The Hill, July 4, 2021]

This year, we celebrate the 245th birthday of the United States. Independence Day is a great day to picnic with friends, spend time outside, and enjoy a fireworks show, but it is also much more than that. It is our duty to honor the men and women who, for the past two and a half centuries, have kept our country free.

We owe a debt of gratitude to American military members and their families and we want to repay them in a very small way by giving them lifetime access to our national parks.

There are few things that instill American pride quite like watching the sun set over the Grand Canyon, seeing bison roam through Yellowstone, or hiking through the forest in Acadia. From sea to shining sea, we are a nation of incredible beauty and biodiversity. Congress recognizes the mental and physical health benefits of outdoor recreation for current servicemembers and veterans. Last December Congress passed and President Trump signed legislation establishing an interagency task force to identify barriers and make recommendations to increase the use of public lands and other outdoor spaces for veteran medical treatment.

Removing barriers and increasing access to our public lands is exactly why we have introduced the bipartisan Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act: to give servicemembers, veterans, and Gold Star families free passes to all national parks and federal recreational lands for life. It is the least we can do for those who gave so much for our country. Currently, active duty servicemembers and vet-

erans are able to receive a one-year free access pass to all parks with entrance fees. With more than 135 co-sponsors, the VIP Act would codify the active duty and veterans passes, as well as make the pass for veterans a lifetime pass. It would also amend the previously codified Gold Star families annual pass and make it a lifetime pass.

As a veteran of the U.S. Army who served for 24 years, Congresswoman Miller-Meeks is no stranger to the myriad hardships that come from being a member of the military. We both are also privileged to represent a host of servicemembers in Congress and want to make it even easier for them to enjoy time with family and friends in America's most beautiful landscapes.

Our national parks are for all of us. No one is more worthy of experiencing open access to these incredible places than the men and women who fought to keep us free and the families who made the ultimate sacrifice.

Unfortunately, it is often all too easy to pay lip service to the military's sacrifice but then not follow through with action to recognize their service. We aim to change that, one legislative recognition at a time.

If you or a member of your family has been a member of the U.S. Armed Forces, we are grateful for your service, today and every day. We hope to see you in a national park soon.

[From Samoa News]

(Source: Congresswoman Uifa'atali Amata's Office)

WASHINGTON, DC.—Congresswoman Uifa'atali Amata voted Wednesday for the Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act, H.R. 4300, which was passed by the full Committee on Natural Resources with bipartisan support. Amata cosponsored the legislation to honor Veterans with free lifetime access to all U.S. National Parks, and other National Forests and public lands.

The Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act specifically honors the nation's servicemembers, veterans, and Gold Star families as VIPs in over 2,000 federally protected places. Amata supported the bill from the start as an original cosponsor upon introduction by Representatives Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-IA) and Ruben Gallego (D-AZ).

Currently, the public can purchase annual "America the Beautiful" passes that allow entry to all parks for one year. The VIP Act works by providing these annual America the Beautiful Passes for free to current military service members, and free lifetime America the Beautiful Passes to veterans and members of Gold Star Families.

"This bill is a special statement of support for our Veterans and military families, and another way to say thank you," said Congresswoman Amata. "The VIP Act honors those serving, those who served, and Gold Star families who lost a loved one in service to the United States, by ensuring you are a VIP in the nation's federally protected historic and beautiful places."

The America the Beautiful pass is an access ticket to over 2,000 places spanning National Parks, National Forests and Wildlife Refuges, which fall under different federal agencies and departments. The National Parks system has 423 sites including 63 Parks, along with trails, historical sites, monuments and memorials. These sites are preserved for national value based on scenery, special geographic features, history, or plant and wildlife conservation. Some Parks, such as the National Park of American Samoa, are generally free to access, but many locations have fees, or passes applied per car or for parking. The America the Beautiful pass covers those entry expenses.

In 2020, the administration made America the Beautiful yearly access free for Veterans

and Gold Star families, but the VIP Act takes it a step further in three ways by extending it to lifetime passes, making the change permanent, and codifying it in law.

[JULY 1, 2021]

BOONE AND CROCKETT JOINS OVER 100 OTHERS ENDORSING VETERANS IN PARKS ACT

The Boone and Crockett Club endorsed H.R. 4300, the Veterans In Parks Act, which was introduced earlier today (<https://republicans-naturalresources.house.gov/newsroom/documentsingle.aspx?DocumentID=409869>) by Reps. Miller-Meeks and Gallego with an additional 133 bipartisan original cosponsors.

BACKGROUND

The America the Beautiful Pass provides access to more than 2,000 federal recreation areas, including our national parks, national forests, and wildlife refuges. This includes some of the country's most iconic treasures, ranging from the majestic Grand Canyon National Park to the aweinspiring Redwood National Forest. Although we can never fully repay the debt we owe to our servicemembers and veterans, the VIP Act would allow them, along with Gold Star Family members, to visit our national parks and public lands free of charge. In 2020, the America the Beautiful annual pass became free for veterans and Gold Star Families. However, this change for veterans has never been codified and could be undone in future years. The VIP Act protects these passes by codifying them and making them lifetime passes instead of annual passes. The VIP Act also creates annual passes for current service members, which can be converted into lifetime passes once they leave the military.

SUPPORTING ORGANIZATIONS

Paralyzed Veterans of America, Vista Outdoor, National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Park Hospitality Association, the National Association of Counties, Outdoor Industry Association, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Evangelical Environmental Network, Wildlife Mississippi, Mississippi River Trust, American Sportfishing Association, American Cultural Resources Association, VoteVets, The Mission Continues, American Battlefield Trust, Camp Chef, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, National Association of RV Parks & Campgrounds (ARVC), Delaware North, Trout Unlimited, National RV Dealers Association (RVDA), American Trails, Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, Boone and Crockett Club, Rugged Range, Bell Helmets, Blackburn, Blackhawk, Bushnell, CamelBak, CCI, Eagle Industries, Federal Ammunition, Giro, HEVI-Shot, Primos, Remington, Bipartisan Policy Center Action, American Hiking Society, Archery Trade Association, ConservAmerica, Southeast Tourism Society, The Corps Network, Outdoor Recreation Roundtable, REI Co-op, Audubon, Sierra Club, U.S. Travel Association, National Wildlife Federation, American Conservation Coalition, America Outdoors, Student Conservation Association, Wildlife Management Institute, Association of Marina Industries, International Inbound Travelers Association, American Horse Council.

[JULY 8, 2021]

HOUSE INTRODUCES BILL TO GIVE MILITARY FAMILIES FREE LIFETIME ACCESS TO NATIONAL PARKS

(By Zach Hester)

(WHNT).—A new bill introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives could allow veterans and Gold Star families free lifetime access to national parks and public lands—and free annual passes to active-duty members of the military.

The bipartisan bill, brought to the floor by Reps. Mariannette Miller-Meeks (R-Iowa)

and Ruben Gallego (D-Ariz.), creates the “America the Beautiful Pass” providing these services members and their families free access to more than 2,000 federal recreation areas, ranging from Acadia National Park to Redwood National Forest.

“As a 24-year Army veteran, I understand the sacrifices made by our military and their loved ones,” said Miller-Meeks. “We owe so much to our amazing servicemembers, veterans, and their families; my Veterans in Parks Act is the least we can do.”

In addition to creating the passes for services members and their families, it also codifies them and makes them last a lifetime. Last year, a similar measure was passed, but never put into law.

“As a veteran, I know firsthand the importance of national parks as a place of connection and healing when dealing with the visible and invisible wounds of war,” Gallego said. “I am proud to co-lead this bill and I will continue to fight for veteran accessibility and support on our nation's public lands.”

The bill lists over 100 co-sponsors, including Alabama Reps. Mo Brooks, Barry Moore, and Jerry Carl.

[July 14, 2021]

PROPOSAL MADE TO EXPAND VETERANS' FREE ACCESS TO ALL NATIONAL PARKS

(By Ariana Figueroa)

WASHINGTON.—U.S. Rep. Mariannette Miller-Meeks of Iowa testified Tuesday before the House Natural Resources Committee hearing in support of bipartisan legislation that would give veterans and Gold Star families free lifetime access to national parks and public federal lands.

“No one is more worthy of experiencing open access to the incredible places that these men and women have fought to keep us free and their families who have also made the ultimate sacrifice along with them,” the Iowa Republican said.

Miller-Meeks is a veteran and worked on the bill, the “Veterans in Parks Act,” with Rep. Ruben Gallego, an Arizona Democrat who is also a veteran.

“As a veteran, I know firsthand the importance of national parks as a place of connection and healing when dealing with the visible and invisible wounds of war,” Gallego said in a statement.

“The VIP Act is an important step in ensuring that veterans, service members, and Gold Star families have access to the public lands they and their loved ones fought to protect.”

Last year, the U.S. National Park Service made annual visits to national parks free for veterans and active duty service members, but the bill, H.R. 4300, would codify that annual pass into law, to be used throughout their lives.

“We can never fully repay our veterans for their service and sacrifice, but we want to show our gratitude by giving them lifetime access to America's beautiful landscapes,” Miller-Meeks said.

The bill would also give active-duty military free annual passes to national parks and public federal lands. Once those members retire, their passes could be converted to lifetime passes. A Gold Star family is an immediate family member of a service member who died in the line of duty.

Capt. John Paluska, from Ottumwa, Iowa, testified before the panel in support of the bill.

He said that in between his deployments, he would often visit Yellowstone National Park “and find my freedom all throughout the park.”

“There's something about connecting to nature at these parks that helps with the

healing,” he said. “I will always carry the wounds of war with me wherever I go, but when I go to these beautiful places, I am able to connect with one of the reasons I decided to serve this incredible, beautiful, country.”

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would note that at our committee markup earlier this month, as the gentlewoman has stated, we added a bipartisan amendment to name this bill after a wounded veteran who, sadly, passed away earlier this year.

Alexander Lofgren was a military and veterans' liaison for Chair GRIJALVA through the Wounded Warrior Fellowship Program and a lover of the outdoors. I was happy to cosponsor Chair GRIJALVA's amendment to name the bill after him and hope that this fitting tribute helps carry on Alex's legacy and provides some level of comfort to his family and friends.

Before I close, I thank Representative MILLER-MEEKS for her leadership on this effort. A veteran herself who served 24 years in the Army as a private, nurse, and doctor, Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS is the perfect champion of this legislation. I commend her for her commitment to bipartisanship and for her work on behalf of our Nation's veterans and her constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HERRELL).

Ms. HERRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a proud original cosponsor and supporter of H.R. 4300, the VIP Act, offered by my friend from Iowa, Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS.

This legislation would codify into Federal law an initiative put into place by the Trump administration last year that grants free passes to visit our national parks, national forests, and wildlife refuges to those who deserve them most, our Nation's Active-Duty servicemembers, veterans, and Gold Star families.

Our national parks and public lands are an essential part of our history and provide great recreational opportunities for the American people. Recreating in the most beautiful places our Nation has to offer brings needed healing and relaxation for those who have and still do put it all on the line to protect the freedoms each of us take for granted as Americans.

As a Member of this body from southern New Mexico, I have the privilege of representing two of the most iconic landmarks in the Nation, White Sands National Park and Carlsbad Caverns. These irreplaceable components of the National Park System welcome thousands of visitors every year and provide a strong economic boost to their surrounding communities.

Providing greater access to our public lands, as this bill does, will only enhance economic opportunity for gateway communities that surround our public lands and provide even greater benefits for our Active-Duty servicemen, veterans, and Gold Star families.

This legislation enjoys the support of a wide cross-section of organizations representing all strains of political opinion and areas of interest, such as the National Association of Counties, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, and National Wildlife Federation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation, and I once again congratulate and thank my colleague, Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS, for her hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), the author of the legislation.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee, and I thank Representative WESTERMAN for yielding me time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my bill, H.R. 4300, the Alexander Lofgren Veterans in Parks Act. I was so proud to introduce this overwhelmingly bipartisan legislation with a fellow veteran, Congressman GALLEGOS.

Our commonsense legislation would give our servicemembers, veterans, and Gold Star families free passes to all of our beautiful national parks and Federal lands for life. This is a reasonable piece of legislation that will support those who sacrifice so much for our liberties.

Our Nation is blessed to have some of the most beautiful national parks and public lands. Each year, millions of Americans access the more than 2,000 Federal recreation areas, including national parks, national forests, and wildlife refuges. This includes some of the Nation's most iconic national treasures, from Acadia National Park in Maine and the Dry Tortugas in Florida to the Redwood National and State Parks forest in California and the Gates of the Arctic in Alaska.

In 2020, the America the Beautiful annual pass became free for veterans and Gold Star families. However, this change for veterans has never been put into law and could be undone in future years.

My bill protects these veteran passes by codifying them into law and making them lifetime passes instead of annual passes that would have to be re-sent every year. Making these passes lifetime instead of annual also makes the job of the Park Service easier and ensures our veterans have full access to the benefits they so richly deserve.

Finally, my legislation also creates annual passes for current servicemembers, which can be converted into lifetime passes once they retire.

From sea to shining sea, we are a Nation of incredible beauty and biodiversity. Congress recognizes the mental and physical health benefits of outdoor recreation for current servicemembers and veterans. In fact, I think at our hearing, there was not a dry eye when Captain John Paluska spoke on behalf of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as a 24-year Army veteran, I understand the sacrifices made by our military and their loved ones and believe that we must do whatever we can to honor these VIPs. My bill provides these Americans with free access to the land they have sacrificed to defend.

Our national parks are there for all of us. Getting outside into nature and enjoying our beautiful country provides an outlet and escape with mental and physical benefits. No one is more worthy of experiencing open access to these incredible places than the men and women who have fought to keep us free and the families who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

Unfortunately, it is all too easy to pay lip service to the military's sacrifice but then not follow through with action to recognize their service. We can never fully repay our veterans for their service and their sacrifice, but we want to show our gratitude by giving them lifetime access to America's most beautiful landscapes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join in supporting my commonsense bill, H.R. 4300, the Alexander Lofgren Veterans in Parks Act.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding, and I thank the gentlewoman for her sponsorship of this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4300, the Veterans in Parks Act.

Across the country, our national parks provide endless opportunities for Americans to learn about our Nation's history and culture. Additionally, national parks generate significant recreational opportunities, which encourage visitors to spend time in the outdoors and enjoy nature.

From Gettysburg to Independence Park, and the Allegheny Portage Railroad to Valley Forge, Pennsylvania is home to 19 national parks and 7 heritage areas providing these benefits to Pennsylvanians throughout the Commonwealth and visitors alike. As the representative of Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District, it continues to be an honor to serve our veterans, Active-Duty servicemen and -women, and proud military families.

This legislation would simply give veterans and Gold Star families free access for life to public lands and also provide free annual passes to Active-Duty servicemembers. Studies show outdoor recreation is an effective way to decrease symptoms of PTSD and

help veterans reintegrate with civilian life. This legislation is a step in the right direction when it comes to assisting our veterans and Active-Duty servicemembers' health.

H.R. 4300 is one way that we can say thank you to our brave men and women in uniform who have selflessly served and have already given so much to protect our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as the father of a combat-wounded soldier and as the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, which also received referral on this legislation, I support this legislation. I urge my colleagues to vote in its favor.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I again urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I commend my colleague from Iowa for her leadership on this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4300, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

AMENDING ALYCE SPOTTED BEAR AND WALTER SOBOLEFF COMMISSION ON NATIVE CHILDREN ACT

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 325) to amend the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act to extend the deadline for a report by the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 325

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. ALYCE SPOTTED BEAR AND WALTER SOBOLEFF COMMISSION ON NATIVE CHILDREN REPORT.

Section 3(f) of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act (Public Law 114-244; 130 Stat. 987) is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "3 years" and inserting "5 years".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr.

WESTERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 325, introduced by Senator LISA MURKOWSKI from Alaska, provides a 2-year extension for the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children to publish its report and make policy recommendations for Federal, State, and Tribal programs that serve Native children.

Native children experience severe health and socioeconomic disparities compared to all other racial and ethnic groups in the United States due to the cycles of intergenerational trauma. It is the Federal Government's trust responsibility to provide for the health and well-being of Native children. However, the COVID-19 pandemic delayed much of the Commission's essential work.

Passage of S. 325 will grant the Commission an extension of time and ensure that the report best addresses the needs of Native children through much-needed expertise and cultural wisdom.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Senator MURKOWSKI, for introducing and championing this critically important legislation, as well as my dear friend and Committee on Natural Resources colleague, DON YOUNG, for leading the House companion bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support S. 325, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1545

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 325, which would amend the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act, to extend the deadline of the Commission's report from 3 years to 5 years after the Commission is fully appointed and fully funded.

In 2016, the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act was signed into law.

The purpose of the legislation was to establish, within the U.S. Department of Justice's Office of Tribal Justice, a commission on Native children and to conduct a comprehensive study regarding the Federal and local programs, grants, and support available for Native communities and Native children.

The legislation stipulated that 3 years after the date on which the Com-

mission is fully appointed and funded, the Commission shall issue a report to Congress with its recommendations on how to achieve better use of existing resources, increased coordination, measurable outcomes, stronger data, enhanced private sector partnerships, and implementation of best practices.

Funding for the Commission was not authorized in the enacted version. However, the fiscal year 2019 Consolidated Appropriations Act provided \$400,000 to the Commission.

With delays in securing funding and the full appointment of Commission members, the Commission was not able to hold its first meeting until December 2019. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic delayed much of the Commission's work.

In response to these challenges faced by the Commission, my good friend, Mr. YOUNG, introduced the House companion bill to S. 325, to ensure that the Commission has adequate time to produce a complete and comprehensive report.

I would like to commend Mr. YOUNG for his continued tireless work on behalf of American Indian and Alaska Natives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the dean of the House.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would like to thank Chairman GRIJALVA and, of course, the ranking member, Mr. WESTERMAN, for the support of scheduling this bill for final passage. I would also like to thank my good friend, DEBBIE DINGELL, for her work. I have been sitting and listening to these bills, these are good bills. So, thank you, I appreciate it.

Mr. Speaker, I introduced this bill on the House side. I would like to thank Congressman CASE and Congressman KAHELE for their sponsorship and support.

As has been mentioned, S. 325 gives Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children 2 more years to complete their important work and report their findings to Congress.

The Commission is tasked with conducting a comprehensive study of Federal, State, local, and Tribal programs that serve Native children with the goal of developing a system that delivers wraparound service for Native youth.

The Commission was put in place, as I mentioned, in 2016, but was not able to have its first meeting until 2019. Further meetings were delayed by COVID, and as we know, things weren't really going according to scale.

But my good friend, Gloria O'Neill, serves as chairman of the Commission, and I am thankful for her leadership on

this issue, and her commitment to ensuring the Commission has enough time to do its important work.

Without this extension, the Commission would be rushing to conclude their regional meetings in order to meet Congress' deadline.

When doing this work, it could have far-reaching effects on Native youth and Native communities. We need to ensure the Commission has enough time to do good work and consider the options.

Also, my colleagues have noticed recently, in a lot of publications, about some of my schools concerning Native students—Native youth, and especially in Canada. Will this Commission also look at that process and see what has happened in the past, and we can avoid what is going to occur in the future?

This is a needed Commission and a needed bill. I urge my colleagues to support S. 325.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank the leadership of the dean of the House, Mr. YOUNG, on this, and Senator MURKOWSKI for the Native children.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 325.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

ACCESS TO CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORTS ACT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2485) to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain an online portal accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports in one place, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2485

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “congressionally mandated report” means a report of a Federal agency that is required by statute to be submitted to either House of Congress or any committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—

(i) PATRIOTIC AND NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS.—The term “congressionally mandated report” does not include a report required under part B of subtitle II of title 36, United States Code.

(ii) INSPECTORS GENERAL.—The term “congressionally mandated report” does not include a report by an office of an inspector general.

(2) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Government Publishing Office.

(3) FEDERAL AGENCY.—The term “Federal agency” has the meaning given the term “federal agency” under section 102 of title 40, United States Code, but does not include the Government Accountability Office or an element of the intelligence community.

(4) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

(5) OPEN FORMAT.—The term “open format” means a file format for storing digital data based on an underlying open standard that—

(A) is not encumbered by any restrictions that would impede reuse; and

(B) is based on an underlying open data standard that is maintained by a standards organization.

(6) REPORTS ONLINE PORTAL.—The term “reports online portal” means the online portal established under section 3(a).

SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF ONLINE PORTAL FOR CONGRESSIONALLY MANDATED REPORTS.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO ESTABLISH ONLINE PORTAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall establish and maintain an online portal accessible by the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of congressionally mandated reports in one place.

(2) EXISTING FUNCTIONALITY.—To the extent possible, the Director shall meet the requirements under paragraph (1) by using existing online portals and functionality under the authority of the Director.

(3) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this Act, the Director shall consult with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Librarian of Congress regarding the requirements for and maintenance of congressionally mandated reports on the reports online portal.

(b) CONTENT AND FUNCTION.—The Director shall ensure that the reports online portal includes the following:

(1) Subject to subsection (c), with respect to each congressionally mandated report, each of the following:

(A) A citation to the statute requiring the report.

(B) An electronic copy of the report, including any transmittal letter associated with the report, in an open format that is platform independent and that is available to the public without restrictions, including restrictions that would impede the re-use of the information in the report.

(C) The ability to retrieve a report, to the extent practicable, through searches based on each, and any combination, of the following:

(i) The title of the report.

(ii) The reporting Federal agency.

(iii) The date of publication.

(iv) Each congressional committee or subcommittee receiving the report, if applicable.

(v) The statute requiring the report.

(vi) Subject tags.

(vii) A unique alphanumeric identifier for the report that is consistent across report editions.

(viii) The serial number, Superintendent of Documents number, or other identification number for the report, if applicable.

(ix) Key words.

(x) Full text search.

(xi) Any other relevant information specified by the Director.

(D) The date on which the report was required to be submitted, and on which the report was submitted, to the reports online portal.

(E) To the extent practicable, a permanent means of accessing the report electronically.

(2) A means for bulk download of all congressionally mandated reports.

(3) A means for downloading individual reports as the result of a search.

(4) An electronic means for the head of each Federal agency to submit to the reports online portal each congressionally mandated report of the agency, as required by section 4.

(5) In tabular form, a list of all congressionally mandated reports that can be searched, sorted, and downloaded by—

(A) reports submitted within the required time;

(B) reports submitted after the date on which such reports were required to be submitted; and

(C) to the extent practicable, reports not submitted.

(c) NONCOMPLIANCE BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) REPORTS NOT SUBMITTED.—If a Federal agency does not submit a congressionally mandated report to the Director, the Director shall to the extent practicable—

(A) include on the reports online portal—

(i) the information required under clauses (i), (ii), (iv), and (v) of subsection (b)(1)(C); and

(ii) the date on which the report was required to be submitted; and

(B) include the congressionally mandated report on the list described in subsection (b)(5)(C).

(2) REPORTS NOT IN OPEN FORMAT.—If a Federal agency submits a congressionally mandated report that is not in an open format, the Director shall include the congressionally mandated report in another format on the reports online portal.

(d) DEADLINE.—The Director shall ensure that information required to be published on the online portal under this Act with respect to a congressionally mandated report or information required under subsection (c) of this section is published—

(1) not later than 30 days after the information is received from the Federal agency involved; or

(2) in the case of information required under subsection (c), not later than 30 days after the deadline under this Act for the Federal agency involved to submit information with respect to the congressionally mandated report involved.

(e) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN REPORTS.—

(1) EXCEPTION DESCRIBED.—A congressionally mandated report which is required by statute to be submitted to a committee of Congress or a subcommittee thereof, including any transmittal letter associated with the report, shall not be submitted to or published on the reports online portal if the chair of a committee or subcommittee to which the report is submitted notifies the Director in writing that the report is to be withheld from submission and publication under this Act.

(2) NOTICE ON PORTAL.—If a report is withheld from submission to or publication on

the reports online portal under paragraph (1), the Director shall post on the portal—

(A) a statement that the report is withheld at the request of a committee or subcommittee involved; and

(B) the written notification provided by the chair of the committee or subcommittee specified in paragraph (1).

(f) FREE ACCESS.—The Director may not charge a fee, require registration, or impose any other limitation in exchange for access to the reports online portal.

(g) UPGRADE CAPABILITY.—The reports online portal shall be enhanced and updated as necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 4. FEDERAL AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) SUBMISSION OF ELECTRONIC COPIES OF REPORTS.—Not earlier than 30 days or later than 45 days after the date on which a congressionally mandated report is submitted to either House of Congress or to any committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof, the head of the Federal agency submitting the congressionally mandated report shall submit to the Director the information required under subparagraphs (A) through (D) of section 3(b)(1) with respect to the congressionally mandated report. Notwithstanding section 6, nothing in this Act shall relieve a Federal agency of any other requirement to publish the congressionally mandated report on the online portal of the Federal agency or otherwise submit the congressionally mandated report to Congress or specific committees of Congress, or subcommittees thereof.

(b) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director, shall issue guidance to agencies on the implementation of this Act.

(c) STRUCTURE OF SUBMITTED REPORT DATA.—The head of each Federal agency shall ensure that each congressionally mandated report submitted to the Director complies with the open format criteria established by the Director in the guidance issued under subsection (b).

(d) POINT OF CONTACT.—The head of each Federal agency shall designate a point of contact for congressionally mandated reports.

(e) REQUIREMENT FOR SUBMISSION.—The Director shall not publish any report through the online portal that is received from anyone other than the head of the applicable Federal agency, or an officer or employee of the Federal agency specifically designated by the head of the Federal agency.

SEC. 5. CHANGING OR REMOVING REPORTS.

(a) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY TO CHANGE OR REMOVE REPORTS.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the head of the Federal agency concerned may change or remove a congressionally mandated report submitted to be published on the reports online portal only if—

(1) the head of the Federal agency consults with each committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof to which the report is required to be submitted (or, in the case of a report which is not required to be submitted to a particular committee of Congress or subcommittee thereof, to each committee with jurisdiction over the agency, as determined by the head of the agency in consultation with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate) prior to changing or removing the report; and

(2) a joint resolution is enacted to authorize the change in or removal of the report.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the head of the Federal agency concerned—

(1) may make technical changes to a report submitted to or published on the online portal;

(2) may remove a report from the online portal if the report was submitted to or published on the online portal in error; and

(3) may withhold information, records, or reports from publication on the online portal in accordance with section 6.

SEC. 6. WITHHOLDING OF INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) require the disclosure of information, records, or reports that are exempt from public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, or that may be withheld under section 552a of title 5, United States Code; or

(2) impose any affirmative duty on the Director to review congressionally mandated reports submitted for publication to the reports online portal for the purpose of identifying and redacting such information or records.

(b) WITHHOLDING OF INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with subsection (a)(1), the head of a Federal agency may withhold from the Director, and from publication on the online portal, any information, records, or reports that are exempt from public disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, or that may be withheld under section 552a of title 5, United States Code.

(2) NATIONAL SECURITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require the publication, on the online portal or otherwise, of any report containing information that is classified, or the public release of which could have a harmful effect on national security.

SEC. 7. IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This Act shall apply with respect to any congressionally mandated report which—

(A) is required by statute to be submitted to the House of Representatives, or the Speaker thereof, or Senate, or the President or President Pro Tempore thereof, at any time before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(B) is included by the Clerk of the House of Representatives or the Secretary of the Senate (as the case may be) on the list of reports received by the House of Representatives or Senate (as the case may be) at any time before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TRANSITION RULE FOR PREVIOUSLY SUBMITTED REPORTS.—To the extent practicable, the Director shall ensure that any congressionally mandated report described in paragraph (1) which was required to be submitted to Congress by a statute enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act is published on the online portal under this Act not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORTS SUBMITTED TO COMMITTEES.—In the case of congressionally mandated reports which are required by statute to be submitted to a committee of Congress or a subcommittee thereof, this Act shall apply with respect to—

(1) any such report which is first required to be submitted by a statute which is enacted on or after the date of the enactment of this Act; and

(2) to the maximum extent practical, any congressionally mandated report which was required to be submitted by a statute enacted before the date of enactment of this Act unless—

(A) the chair of the committee, or subcommittee thereof, to which the report was required to be submitted notifies the Director in writing that the report is to be withheld from publication; and

(B) the Director publishes the notification on the online portal.

SEC. 8. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative MIKE QUIGLEY for his persistence in pursuing this good government legislation. Hopefully, we can get this bill enacted this Congress.

H.R. 2485, the Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act, is a non-controversial bill that has been approved by the Oversight and Reform Committee many times.

The bill is a commonsense measure that would make the government more transparent and accountable. It would create a one-stop-shop where Congress and members of the public could access agency reports to Congress.

Federal agencies submit thousands of reports to Congress each year. This bill will improve congressional oversight by making it easy to find and access those reports.

H.R. 2485 would give the public access to agency reports. Currently, members of the public often have to file requests under the Freedom of Information Act to obtain agency reports to Congress because many of these reports are not available online.

An online library of Federal reports would improve our ability to use the information in them to make sound policy. It also would encourage agency compliance with reporting requirements.

Finally, it would support timely access to the reports by State and local governments, students, academics, and others with the additional benefit of decreasing the burden on agencies to process Freedom of Information Act requests.

The Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act is endorsed by almost 40 organizations from across the political spectrum.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill and urge all my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act, long championed by my colleague, Mr. MIKE QUIGLEY, represents an honest effort to modernize Congress and improve the Article I power of the legislative branch.

The bill does this by bolstering the ability of Congress to access and understand the thousands of legally mandated reports compiled by the executive branch and sent to Congress each year.

It is estimated that Federal agencies write and send to Congress over 4,000 written reports every 2 years. That is a lot of valuable information for the American people and their representatives in the U.S. House.

These mandated reports contain insights into activities of Federal agencies. Insights like the status of an agency establishing a new program or updates on efforts to combat waste, fraud, and abuse. However, there is currently no central inventory for congressional Members or our staff to access these reports.

Most reports are sent over via email and can get lost in the shuffle of an ever-changing and evolving Congress, or they are only sent to specific committees which prevents the rest of Congress and the public from viewing them. This bill fixes that problem.

H.R. 2485 establishes a central and publicly available portal of these reports at the Government Publishing Office. Congress and members of the public will be able to fully search, sort, and download reports from this website. This gives the whole of Congress and America's citizens convenient access to all executive agency reports submitted to Congress. These are reports that the taxpayers paid for.

This bill also includes protections for classified and sensitive information in keeping with the principles of the Freedom of Information Act.

In summary, once Congress can get a handle on all the mandated reports, we can take actions to reduce any unnecessary agency reporting burdens.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Mr. MIKE QUIGLEY, for working together with the House Oversight and Reform Committee's ranking member, JAMES COMER, on this good government bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no further speakers, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act, which I have worked on along with my House Oversight and Reform Committee colleague, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY.

This bill will help modernize Congress and expand the legislative branch's oversight over the executive branch.

Every year, Federal agencies prepare and submit thousands of in-depth reports to various congressional committees. These reports cover topics such as the implementation status of new agency programs or legal requirements in recently passed laws.

They also cover the ongoing effort of the Federal Government to address waste, fraud, and abuse as well as policy priorities like our Nation's financial stability, cybersecurity, homeland security, and public health readiness.

In short, congressionally mandated reports are a key part of how the United States Congress fulfills its Article I oversight duties over the executive branch.

Beyond holding hearings and passing laws, the legislative branch mandates that executive branch agencies report to the House and Senate on their activities and compliance with the law.

As representatives in the House, we have an obligation to the American people to maintain constant visibility into the executive branch. And congressionally mandated reports are one of our most useful, daily oversight tools.

However, there is a problem. Congress lacks a central inventory of the reports we require Federal agencies to send us. This makes it hard to know for certain if agencies are fulfilling their legal reporting obligations or for new congressional Members and staff to find reports from previous years.

Additionally, the American public has little to no access to these valuable reports, which contain key insights into agency programs and missions that directly affect them.

H.R. 2485 is the solution we need. With the bill's establishment of a single website at the Government Publishing Office we will be able to find the reports we need when we need them.

A fully searchable inventory of these reports makes complete sense in the modern world. This new portal will enable each and every House Member and staffer to do their job on behalf of the American people they represent.

After all, American taxpayer dollars are funding the preparation of these reports as well as the agency activities they report on.

And for sensitive reports containing classified information, there are protections to ensure that only the proper congressional committees will be able to access such reports.

Again, I want to thank my colleague, Mr. MIKE QUIGLEY, for working with me to improve and reintroduce this government-wide transparency bill.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2485.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 2485, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2485, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to establish and maintain a single online portal accessible to the public that allows the public to obtain electronic copies of all congressionally mandated reports, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET JUSTIFICATION TRANSPARENCY ACT OF 2021

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 272) to amend the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006, to require the budget justifications and appropriation requests of agencies be made publicly available.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 272

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS AND APPROPRIATION REQUESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. FULL DISCLOSURE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Not less frequently than monthly when practicable, and in any event not less frequently than quarterly, the Secretary (in consultation with the Director and, with respect to information described in subsection (b)(2), the head of the applicable Federal agency) shall ensure that updated information with respect to the information described in subsection (b) is posted on the website established under section 2.

"(b) INFORMATION TO BE POSTED.—

"(1) FUNDS.—For any funds made available to or expended by a Federal agency or component of a Federal agency, the information to be posted shall include—

"(A) for each appropriations account, including an expired or unexpired appropriations account, the amount—

"(i) of budget authority appropriated;

"(ii) that is obligated;

"(iii) of unobligated balances; and

"(iv) of any other budgetary resources;

"(B) from which accounts and in what amount—

"(i) appropriations are obligated for each program activity; and

"(ii) outlays are made for each program activity;

"(C) from which accounts and in what amount—

"(i) appropriations are obligated for each object class; and

"(ii) outlays are made for each object class; and

"(D) for each program activity, the amount—

"(i) obligated for each object class; and

"(ii) of outlays made for each object class.

"(2) BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS.—

"(A) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

"(i) the term 'budget justification materials' means the annual budget justification materials of a Federal agency, or a component of a Federal agency, that are submitted, in conjunction with the budget of the United States Government submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

"(ii) the term 'open Government data asset' has the meaning given that term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code.

"(B) INFORMATION.—The information to be posted—

"(i) shall include any budget justification materials—

"(I) for the second fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this paragraph, and each fiscal year thereafter; and

"(II) to the extent practicable, that were released for any fiscal year before the date of enactment of this paragraph; and

"(ii) shall not include budget justification materials the disclosure of which is prohibited by law, that are classified, or that are exempt from disclosure under section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code.

"(C) FORMAT.—Budget justification materials shall be posted under subparagraph (B)—

"(i) as an open Government data asset;

"(ii) in a manner that enables users to download individual reports, download all reports in bulk, and download in bulk the results of a search, to the extent practicable; and

"(iii) in a structured data format, to the extent practicable.

"(D) DEADLINE.—The budget justification materials required to be posted under subparagraph (B)(i) shall be posted not later than 2 weeks after the date on which the budget justification materials are first submitted to Congress.

"(E) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize a Federal agency, or a component of a Federal agency, to destroy any budget justification materials relating to a fiscal year before the fiscal year described in subparagraph (B)(i)."

(b) INFORMATION REGARDING AGENCY BUDGET JUSTIFICATIONS.—Section 1105 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i)(1) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall make publicly available on a website, and continuously update, a tabular list for each fiscal year of each agency that submits budget justification materials, which shall include—

"(A) the name of the agency;

"(B) a unique identifier that identifies the agency;

"(C) to the extent practicable, the date on which the budget justification materials of the agency are first submitted to Congress;

"(D) the date on which the budget justification materials of the agency are posted online under section 3 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note);

"(E) the uniform resource locator where the budget justification materials are published on the website of the agency; and

"(F) a single data set that contains the information described in subparagraphs (A) through (E) with respect to the agency for all fiscal years for which budget justifications of the agency are made available under

section 3 of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) in a structured data format.

“(2)(A) Each agency that submits budget justification materials shall make the materials available on the website of the agency, in accordance with the policies established by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget under subparagraph (B).

“(B) Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall establish policies and data standards for agencies relating to making available materials under subparagraph (A), which shall include guidelines for making budget justification materials available in a format aligned with the requirements of section 3(b)(2)(C) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note) and using a uniform resource locator that is in a consistent format across agencies and is descriptive, memorable, and pronounceable, such as the format of ‘agencyname.gov/budget’.

“(C) If the Director of the Office of Management and Budget maintains a public website that contains the budget of the United States Government submitted under subsection (a) and any related materials, such website shall also contain a link to the tabular list required under paragraph (1).

“(3) In this subsection, the term ‘budget justification materials’ has the meaning given that term in section 3(b)(2) of the Federal Funding Accountability and Transparency Act of 2006 (31 U.S.C. 6101 note).”.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go-Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us, the Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act, is a commonsense, good government measure every Member should support.

It would require the congressional budget justification documents that agencies prepare for congressional committees to be posted online in a centralized, searchable database.

This would make these detailed, plain-language explanations of how

agencies plan to spend taxpayer dollars more accessible to the public.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative MIKE QUIGLEY for his work on the House companion to this measure. He has a long history as a strong advocate of transparency in the operations of the Federal Government.

This bill builds on the work of the Committee to improve government transparency by allowing the public to more easily learn about how Federal agencies spend their taxpayer dollars.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 272, the Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act.

The Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act is a long overdue reform that would ensure Congress and the Nation's taxpayers can understand the full scope and context of the annual Federal budget.

I would like to thank Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY for working together with House Oversight and Reform Committee Ranking Member COMER to pass the nearly identical companion bill, H.R. 22, through the House at the beginning of this year.

Last year, more than \$6.8 trillion was spent to fight the COVID-19 pandemic.

Public spending transparency resources like USAspending.gov and PandemicOversight.gov, helped the public track agency spending, but they are not enough.

Annual Federal agency budget justifications provide detailed and plain language explanations of how agencies plan to spend congressionally appropriated funds.

□ 1600

However, these necessary justification materials are scattered across agency websites and often difficult to find. This bipartisan legislation will ensure the American people and Congress can easily access these important budget justification materials to review proposed agency spending.

The bill requires every agency to make their annual budget justification materials publicly available on a single website. To do this, the bill requires the Office of Management and Budget to issue a full listing of agency budget justifications and the individual agency web pages where they are posted.

Thanks to another law produced by the House Oversight and Reform Committee, the 2018 Good Accounting Obligation in Government Act, congressional budget justifications also now list unimplemented Inspector General audit and GAO report recommendations. This means the bill will also help Congress and the public annually track open IG and GAO oversight recommendations.

The Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act makes the executive branch annual budget process truly open to the American people and

provides needed transparency of each agency's detailed budget justifications.

The American public and their congressional Representatives deserve full access to agency plans to spend their hard-earned tax dollars. America's tax dollars must be used wisely, and I encourage my colleagues to support this bipartisan bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no further speakers, I am prepared to close.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. COMER).

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 272, the Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act.

This bill is a timely and important reform to ensure Congress and the public can review all Federal spending. This bipartisan legislation make it possible for the public and every member of Congress to readily find and compare the annual budget justification and supporting materials that each agency prepares and sends to Congress. This detailed review is critical to ensuring that our tax dollars are spent properly.

This reform is also needed now more than ever. Last year alone, the Federal Government spent more than \$6.8 trillion. Unfortunately, this trend in massive government spending does not seem to be slowing down any time soon.

The Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act will require all agencies to make their budget justification materials available online in plain language. In doing so, this legislation will empower Congress' ability to conduct oversight of Federal agencies' use of taxpayer dollars by consolidating agency data. It will also provide much-needed transparency to the American people.

Requiring each agency to provide detailed plain language explanations of how they intend to spend taxpayer dollars ensures Americans can review those decisions at any time.

I want to thank my colleague, Congressman MIKE QUIGLEY, for working with me on H.R. 22 which we were able to pass through the House back on January 5 of this year. I was glad to see the Senate's recent action advancing this much-needed reform bill through Congress.

This legislation illustrates the importance of working across the aisle to improve congressional oversight to ensure American tax dollars are spent efficiently and effectively. Today the House sends the Congressional Budget Justification Transparency Act to the President's desk.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working on many more bipartisan government accountability bills and encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this commonsense transparency bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of S. 272, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KAHELE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 272.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

FEDERAL CAREER OPPORTUNITIES IN COMPUTER SCIENCE WORK ACT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3533) to establish occupational series for Federal positions in software development, software engineering, data science, and data management, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3533

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. OCCUPATIONAL SERIES FOR DIGITAL CAREER FIELDS.

Not later than 270 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall, pursuant to chapter 51 of title 5, United States Code, establish or update existing occupational series covering Federal Government positions in the fields of software development, software engineering, data science, and data management.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on H.R. 3533.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3533, the Federal Career Opportunities

in Computer Science Work Act. I commend my colleagues, Representative OBERNOLTE and Representative WELCH, for their bipartisan work on this measure.

This bill would require the Office of Personnel Management to update or establish occupational series for Federal civilian positions in software development, software engineering, data science, and data management within 270 days of enactment.

It would implement a recommendation that was included in the final report of the National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence. In its report, the commission stated: “The artificial intelligence competition will not be won by the side with the best technology. It will be won by the side with the best, most diverse and tech-savvy talent.”

To attract and retain digital talent, the commission recommended that the Federal Government create the civilian occupational series that are included in this bill. This bipartisan bill would help support recruitment of professionals with these specialized skills for Federal employment.

This is an important step in helping Federal agencies recruit, hire, and retain the talent that is needed to remain competitive in the digital domain.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3533, the Federal Career Opportunities in Computer Science Work Act.

In a world that increasingly relies on digital technologies, the Federal Government needs to be able to hire and attract the right talent; therefore, the ability to recruit and retain qualified software and data professionals is important, particularly as our government and private sector must withstand more frequent and sophisticated cybersecurity threats.

The National Security Commission on Artificial Intelligence released their final report earlier this year and found that “Digitally talented people should be able to reasonably expect to spend a career performing meaningful work focused on their field of expertise in government.”

The report goes on to recommend that new Federal career fields in digital technologies be established by creating new civilian occupational series for software development, software engineering, knowledge management, and data science.

The bill under consideration requires the Office of Personnel Management to either update existing occupational series or create new ones in the fields of software development, software engineering, data management, and data science. This will ensure that the Federal workforce represents current specialized fields necessary to bringing

America’s Government into the 21st century.

The bill also enables the Federal Government to better target recruiting and retain qualified professionals in these essential fields.

I appreciate Congressman OBERNOLTE’s and Congressman WELCH’s leadership on this issue. I encourage my colleagues to support this smart government modernization bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. OBERNOLTE), the sponsor of this bill.

Mr. OBERNOLTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, the Federal Career Opportunities in Computer Sciences Work Act.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with most of the country, was recently horrified by the cyberattacks against critical parts of our national infrastructure, in particular, the cyberattack against Colonial Pipeline that shut down gasoline deliveries for much of the Eastern United States and the cyberattacks against JBS meat processing, which disrupted operations at one of the largest food processing facilities in our country.

It has become increasingly clear that dealing with these threats will require highly trained professionals in the computer sciences and the data sciences as part of not just our civilian workforce but also our Federal workforce.

Unfortunately, many people are surprised to learn that we do not currently have Federal career occupational series that are dedicated to the computer sciences. This bill, the Federal Career Opportunities in Computer Sciences Work Act, will establish those series in such fields as data management, artificial intelligence, and software engineering. This will enable our Federal Government to better attract and retain the highly qualified technical computer scientist talent that is needed to respond to these attacks in the future.

This is bipartisan legislation. It is an easy and commonsense solution to this problem, and I urge support for this bill.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan legislation that will help improve the technical skills of our Federal workforce and, ultimately, modernize our government.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 3533, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3533, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

FEDERAL ROTATIONAL CYBER WORKFORCE PROGRAM ACT OF 2021

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3599) to establish a Federal rotational cyber workforce program for the Federal cyber workforce, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3599

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act of 2021”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given the term “Executive agency” in section 105 of title 5, United States Code, except that the term does not include the Government Accountability Office.

(2) COMPETITIVE SERVICE.—The term “competitive service” has the meaning given that term in section 2102 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) COUNCILS.—The term “Councils” means—

(A) the Chief Human Capital Officers Council established under section 1303 of the Chief Human Capital Officers Act of 2002 (5 U.S.C. 1401 note); and

(B) the Chief Information Officers Council established under section 3603 of title 44, United States Code.

(4) CYBER WORKFORCE POSITION.—The term “cyber workforce position” means a position identified as having information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related functions under section 303 of the Federal Cybersecurity Workforce Assessment Act of 2015 (5 U.S.C. 301 note).

(5) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

(6) EMPLOYEE.—The term “employee” has the meaning given the term in section 2105 of title 5, United States Code.

(7) EMPLOYING AGENCY.—The term “employing agency” means the agency from which an employee is detailed to a rotational cyber workforce position.

(8) EXCEPTED SERVICE.—The term “excepted service” has the meaning given that term in section 2103 of title 5, United States Code.

(9) ROTATIONAL CYBER WORKFORCE POSITION.—The term “rotational cyber workforce position” means a cyber workforce position

with respect to which a determination has been made under section 3(a)(1).

(10) ROTATIONAL CYBER WORKFORCE PROGRAM.—The term “rotational cyber workforce program” means the program for the detail of employees among rotational cyber workforce positions at agencies.

(11) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. ROTATIONAL CYBER WORKFORCE POSITIONS.

(a) DETERMINATION WITH RESPECT TO ROTATIONAL SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of each agency may determine that a cyber workforce position in that agency is eligible for the rotational cyber workforce program, which shall not be construed to modify the requirement under section 4(b)(3) that participation in the rotational cyber workforce program by an employee shall be voluntary.

(2) NOTICE PROVIDED.—The head of an agency shall submit to the Director—

(A) notice regarding any determination made by the head of the agency under paragraph (1); and

(B) for each position with respect to which the head of the agency makes a determination under paragraph (1), the information required under subsection (b)(1).

(b) PREPARATION OF LIST.—The Director, with assistance from the Councils and the Secretary, shall develop a list of rotational cyber workforce positions that—

(1) with respect to each such position, to the extent that the information does not disclose sensitive national security information, includes—

(A) the title of the position;

(B) the occupational series with respect to the position;

(C) the grade level or work level with respect to the position;

(D) the agency in which the position is located;

(E) the duty location with respect to the position; and

(F) the major duties and functions of the position; and

(2) shall be used to support the rotational cyber workforce program.

(c) DISTRIBUTION OF LIST.—Not less frequently than annually, the Director shall distribute an updated list developed under subsection (b) to the head of each agency and other appropriate entities.

SEC. 4. ROTATIONAL CYBER WORKFORCE PROGRAM.

(a) OPERATION PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and in consultation with the Councils, the Secretary, representatives of other agencies, and any other entity as the Director determines appropriate, the Director shall develop and issue a Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program operation plan providing policies, processes, and procedures for a program for the detailing of employees among rotational cyber workforce positions at agencies, which may be incorporated into and implemented through mechanisms in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) UPDATING.—The Director may, in consultation with the Councils, the Secretary, and other entities as the Director determines appropriate, periodically update the operation plan developed and issued under paragraph (1).

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The operation plan developed and issued under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum—

(1) identify agencies for participation in the rotational cyber workforce program;

(2) establish procedures for the rotational cyber workforce program, including—

(A) any training, education, or career development requirements associated with par-

ticipation in the rotational cyber workforce program;

(B) any prerequisites or requirements for participation in the rotational cyber workforce program; and

(C) appropriate rotational cyber workforce program performance measures, reporting requirements, employee exit surveys, and other accountability devices for the evaluation of the program;

(3) provide that participation in the rotational cyber workforce program by an employee shall be voluntary;

(4) provide that an employee shall be eligible to participate in the rotational cyber workforce program if the head of the employing agency of the employee, or a designee of the head of the employing agency of the employee, approves of the participation of the employee;

(5) provide that the detail of an employee to a rotational cyber workforce position under the rotational cyber workforce program shall be on a nonreimbursable basis;

(6) provide that agencies may agree to partner to ensure that the employing agency of an employee that participates in the rotational cyber workforce program is able to fill the position vacated by the employee;

(7) require that an employee detailed to a rotational cyber workforce position under the rotational cyber workforce program, upon the end of the period of service with respect to the detail, shall be entitled to return to the position held by the employee, or an equivalent position, in the employing agency of the employee without loss of pay, seniority, or other rights or benefits to which the employee would have been entitled had the employee not been detailed;

(8) provide that discretion with respect to the assignment of an employee under the rotational cyber workforce program shall remain with the employing agency of the employee;

(9) require that an employee detailed to a rotational cyber workforce position under the rotational cyber workforce program in an agency that is not the employing agency of the employee shall have all the rights that would be available to the employee if the employee were detailed under a provision of law other than this Act from the employing agency to the agency in which the rotational cyber workforce position is located;

(10) provide that participation by an employee in the rotational cyber workforce program shall not constitute a change in the conditions of the employment of the employee; and

(11) provide that an employee participating in the rotational cyber workforce program shall receive performance evaluations relating to service in the rotational cyber workforce program in a participating agency that are—

(A) prepared by an appropriate officer, supervisor, or management official of the employing agency, acting in coordination with the supervisor at the agency in which the employee is performing service in the rotational cyber workforce position;

(B) based on objectives identified in the operation plan with respect to the employee; and

(C) based in whole or in part on the contribution of the employee to the agency in which the employee performed such service, as communicated from that agency to the employing agency of the employee.

(c) PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS FOR ROTATIONAL SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employee serving in a cyber workforce position in an agency may, with the approval of the head of the agency, submit an application for detail to a rotational cyber workforce position that appears on the list developed under section 3(b).

(2) OPM APPROVAL FOR CERTAIN POSITIONS.—An employee serving in a position in the expected service may only be selected for a rotational cyber workforce position that is in the competitive service with the prior approval of the Office of Personnel Management, in accordance with section 300.301 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor thereto.

(3) SELECTION AND TERM.—

(A) SELECTION.—The head of an agency shall select an employee for a rotational cyber workforce position under the rotational cyber workforce program in a manner that is consistent with the merit system principles under section 2301(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(B) TERM.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), and notwithstanding section 3341(b) of title 5, United States Code, a detail to a rotational cyber workforce position shall be for a period of not less than 180 days and not more than 1 year.

(C) EXTENSION.—The Chief Human Capital Officer of the agency to which an employee is detailed under the rotational cyber workforce program may extend the period of a detail described in subparagraph (B) for a period of 60 days unless the Chief Human Capital Officer of the employing agency of the employee objects to that extension.

(4) WRITTEN SERVICE AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The detail of an employee to a rotational cyber workforce position shall be contingent upon the employee entering into a written service agreement with the employing agency under which the employee is required to complete a period of employment with the employing agency following the conclusion of the detail that is equal in length to the period of the detail.

(B) OTHER AGREEMENTS AND OBLIGATIONS.—A written service agreement under subparagraph (A) shall not supersede or modify the terms or conditions of any other service agreement entered into by the employee under any other authority or relieve the obligations between the employee and the employing agency under such a service agreement. Nothing in this subparagraph prevents an employing agency from terminating a service agreement entered into under any other authority under the terms of such agreement or as required by law or regulation.

SEC. 5. REPORTING BY GAO.

Not later than the end of the third fiscal year after the fiscal year in which the operation plan under section 4(a) is issued, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report assessing the operation and effectiveness of the rotational cyber workforce program, which shall address, at a minimum—

(1) the extent to which agencies have participated in the rotational cyber workforce program, including whether the head of each such participating agency has—

(A) identified positions within the agency that are rotational cyber workforce positions;

(B) had employees from other participating agencies serve in positions described in subparagraph (A); and

(C) had employees of the agency request to serve in rotational cyber workforce positions under the rotational cyber workforce program in participating agencies, including a description of how many such requests were approved; and

(2) the experiences of employees serving in rotational cyber workforce positions under the rotational cyber workforce program, including an assessment of—

(A) the period of service;

(B) the positions (including grade level and occupational series or work level) held by

employees before completing service in a rotational cyber workforce position under the rotational cyber workforce program;

(C) the extent to which each employee who completed service in a rotational cyber workforce position under the rotational cyber workforce program achieved a higher skill level, or attained a skill level in a different area, with respect to information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related functions; and

(D) the extent to which service in rotational cyber workforce positions has affected intra-agency and interagency integration and coordination of cyber practices, functions, and personnel management.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

Effective 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, this Act is repealed.

SEC. 7. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3599.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia? There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 3599, the Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act. This bill is the product of bipartisan cooperation of our Oversight and Reform Committee members, Representatives RO KHANNA and NANCY MACE, and I want to thank them for their work on this bill.

Earlier this year, our committee held a hearing on the Government Accountability Office’s 2021 High-Risk Report, which details the areas of government operations at greatest risk of failing to meet the considerable challenges they face.

Cybersecurity was near the top of the list, along with the cyber skills gap that persists across the Federal workforce. As the Government Accountability Office report described, Federal agencies are struggling to ensure that staff have the skills required to address the critical cybersecurity risks and challenges that our government faces.

Recent cyberattacks have demonstrated the dire consequences of failing to improve the Federal Government’s cybersecurity operations. These include the SolarWinds breach, in

which Russian hackers infiltrated the networks of nine Federal agencies and went undetected for months.

Around the same time, cyberattacks linked to the Chinese government targeted Microsoft’s enterprise email software and threatened the internal data of Federal agencies. In addition, Russian hackers successfully breached the servers of the U.S. Department of State and stole thousands of emails.

The Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act, as it is called, would enable cybersecurity professionals in the Federal Government to rotate through assignments outside of their regular position. This would allow more agencies to benefit from their enterprise and give program participants the opportunities for professional development. The program would be authorized for 5 years and, after 3 years, the Government Accountability Office would assess the operation and effectiveness of the program.

This legislation would go a long way toward improving Federal agencies’ capacity to strengthen cybersecurity operations, help retain top talent, and facilitate the exchange of expertise in this critical field.

The security of Federal information technology systems and data is essential to national security, to preserving public trust in government institutions, and to ensuring that agencies meet their missions in serving the American people.

I strongly support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has significant work to do on the cybersecurity front. My colleagues, Representatives KHANNA and MACE, recognized this harsh reality when crafting their bill to improve our Federal workforce’s cybersecurity and IT expertise.

We face many challenges, including adequately securing IT infrastructure from cyber intrusions, supply chain hacks, and ransomware, each the subject of recent front-page news.

Our cyber readiness depends, in part, upon our ability to maintain a prepared and capable Federal workforce to defend our Nation’s government from a relentless onslaught of cyberattacks.

Toward that end, the Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act continues efforts created and implemented during the Trump administration to promote cyber rotational details throughout Federal agencies so that our valuable Federal cyber experts continue to sharpen their skills.

This bill seeks to codify an additional rotational opportunity for cyber-focused professionals throughout the Federal Government.

Former President Trump’s executive order, “America’s Cybersecurity Workforce,” established a mechanism for Federal employees to be detailed to

other agencies through a cybersecurity rotational assignment program. The Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act places management of a similar type of program under the Office of Personnel Management.

Importantly, for oversight purposes, the bill establishes requirements for a detailed operational plan and a report from the Government Accountability Office to enable congressional oversight. This will help Congress evaluate whether the rotational program is running as intended and meaningfully addressing both personnel and agency needs.

If this new rotational program is not providing the intended value to the Federal Government, then Congress will have the opportunity to decline reauthorizing the program after it sunsets in 5 years. This is a valuable safety valve to the expansion of the Federal Government, which I am glad to see included in this bill.

I thank my colleagues for their work on this bipartisan bill, which builds upon the cyber workforce efforts of the prior administration.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Delegate NORTON for her leadership, and I thank Ranking Member COMER for his leadership on the bill and, of course, Representative MACE, who has been a colleague and helped craft this.

Everyone recognizes that our country faces cyberattacks. In the private sector, we don't silo cybersecurity officials. You don't say, "You just work in one department." They rotate through a company. We shouldn't have separate silos in the Federal Government.

This bill is just common sense. It says that we need to have a rotational system in the Federal Government so that you can have expertise from all the different agencies, and we can have a comprehensive response. It helps us get talent. And it is bipartisan.

We should give credit to the previous administration for having, as was pointed out, the executive order. I worked with Matt Lira at the previous White House. There is nothing that is partisan about making sure that America isn't attacked with cybercrimes and cyberattacks. That is a bipartisan initiative, and this does build on the work they did. It makes it stronger, and we put, ultimately, resources toward it.

But I am proud of the work. I am proud of working with Representative MACE on it. Frankly, I think we ought to be doing more things in this body in a bipartisan way that strengthen American security.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from South Carolina (Ms. MACE).

Ms. MACE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of H.R. 3599, the Federal Ro-

tational Cyber Workforce Program Act. It is a long title, but it is a very good bill. I thank my colleague, Ro KHANNA, for his leadership.

Cybersecurity is national security, and this is one area where it is not Democrat or Republican. When 11 Federal agencies were hacked last year by an organization affiliated with Russia, they didn't care if you had an R or a D by your name.

Imagine if, in the Federal Government, or at least a portion of the Federal Government, we could work and operate more like a business than a bureaucracy. Well, we can do that right here today with H.R. 3599.

I thank, again, Ro KHANNA for his leadership and for allowing me the opportunity to work together with him on this. This is the third bill I have worked on that I hope will pass on the floor of the House tonight.

We have an opportunity to show tremendous leadership here today. I have heard a number of my colleagues here this afternoon, Republicans and Democrats, working together for the American people, putting the American people first, and that is what we are doing.

Every day, criminal elements are attempting to steal our secrets, disrupt our infrastructure, and damage our economy by extorting money from businesses and organizations across the United States.

Most recently, in the State of South Carolina, we saw the high-profile Colonial Pipeline hacking and attack. It is a reminder that America's adversaries are creative and cunning and that our government must be the same to combat this growing threat.

It is imperative that our government be able to obtain, train, and retain the cyber and technology talent needed to counter these sophisticated hackers across the globe. The Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act will allow Federal employees to collaborate and broaden their work experiences, their knowledge, and their skill sets across Federal agencies, much in the same way their counterparts do in the private sector.

I thank my colleagues today, Republicans and Democrats, and I urge each and every one of them to vote in favor of this legislation this evening.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to improve the readiness of our Nation's cyber workforce through the expansion of cyber rotations between our Federal agencies. I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 3599, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3599, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

□ 1630

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER SALARY HOME RULE ACT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1204) to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to permit the District of Columbia to establish the rate of pay of the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1204

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Chief Financial Officer Salary Home Rule Act".

SEC. 2. PERMITTING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO ESTABLISH RATE OF PAY OF CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Section 424(b)(2)(E) of the District of Columbia Home Rule Act (sec. 1-204.24b(b)(5), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

"(E) PAY.—The Chief Financial Officer shall be paid at the greater of—

"(i) a rate such that the total amount of compensation paid during any calendar year is equal to the limit on total pay which is applicable during the year under section 5307 of title 5, United States Code, to an employee described in section 5307(d) of such title; or

"(ii) a rate established in law by the District of Columbia, except that any rate established under this clause which is applicable to any individual serving as the Chief Financial Officer shall not be reduced during any period of the individual's service as Chief Financial Officer."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will give the District of Columbia the authority to increase the pay of the D.C. chief financial officer. D.C. requested that I introduce this bill so that it can retain and recruit the best CFOs. At the outset, I want to emphasize that the CFO is paid exclusively with local D.C. funds, not Federal funds.

Under the D.C. Home Rule Act, Congress established a maximum rate of pay for the CFO, and the D.C. council has no authority to increase that rate. Congress does not cap, or otherwise establish, the pay of any other D.C. employee. Under this bill, the CFO would be paid at the greater of a rate equal to the maximum rate of pay of the CFO in current law or at a rate established in law by the District of Columbia.

The CFO was established by Congress in 1995. Congress vested the CFO with extraordinary powers and designed the CFO to be independent of the D.C. Mayor and council. The CFO may be removed only for cause by the Mayor, subject to the approval of two-thirds of the council and a 30-day congressional review and comment period. This bill would maintain the independence of the CFO by establishing a permanent floor on the CFO's pay and by prohibiting the council from reducing the CFO's pay during the CFO's term.

The D.C. CFO is unique in the United States. D.C. cannot obligate or expend funds without the CFO's certification that available funds exist. The CFO manages a \$17 billion budget that consists of State, county, and city functions, and the CFO has more than 1,700 employees.

D.C. is currently searching for a permanent CFO. Although the CFO is the most important non-elected official in the district, more than 20 D.C. employees are paid more than the CFO. D.C. must compete with both the private and public sectors for high-quality CFOs, and there are many private- and public-sector CFOs who are paid more than the D.C. CFO.

I thank Chairwoman MALONEY for her support of this bill, and I thank Ranking Member COMER for his support of this bill in committee.

This bill is critical to the financial operations of the District of Columbia. I urge my colleagues to support it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the chief financial officer plays an essential role in managing the District of Columbia's financial challenges and should be properly compensated for such efforts.

I understand some of my colleagues may be concerned about the financial health of the District of Columbia, and I share many of those concerns. But that is why we need to ensure the best people are selected to fill the CFO position.

One way to attract the best candidates in a job search is by paying professionals a competitive salary. The CFO is responsible for the District's fi-

nancial operations, including more than 1,700 staff members in the district's multi-billion-dollar budget.

If the District believes that it needs to adjust the rate of pay for this position to recruit a more qualified senior financial management official, then Congress should support such efforts.

I believe compensation for local executives is a matter best handled at the local level, and I believe this bill balances local autonomy with a commonsense solution for attracting talent to the District.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, because I believe this is sensible legislation and good for the financial health of the District of Columbia, I will vote in support of this sensible bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 1204, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1204.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

CHAI SUTHAMMANONT REMEMBRANCE ACT OF 2021

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 978) to require the head of each agency to establish a safety plan relating to COVID-19 for any worksite at which employees or contractors are required to be physically present during the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 978

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chai Suthammanont Remembrance Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. WORKSITE SAFETY FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES AND CONTRACTORS.

(a) ISSUANCE OF POLICIES AND PROCEDURES BY AGENCIES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the head of each agency, in consultation with the Chief Human Capital Officer of the agency and the Assistant Director of Administration of the agency (or any individual holding an equivalent position) shall—

(1) establish, and publish on the website of that agency, a safety plan containing procedures and policies for—

(A) covered worksites; and
(B) being present at a covered worksite; and

(2) communicate such plan to each employee of the agency and contractor of the agency (and any subcontractor thereof at any tier) in such a manner as to ensure that each such employee and contractor acknowledges receipt and understanding of the plan.

(b) PLAN.—The safety plan required under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, include the following:

(1) A description of the efforts of the agency with respect to mitigating the spread of COVID-19 at covered worksites, including the following:

(A) A description of any personal protective equipment that is being or will be provided by the agency to any employee of the agency and contractor of the agency (and any subcontractor thereof at any tier) physically present at a covered worksite.

(B) A description of any procedures established by the agency for—

(i) testing employees of the agency and contractors of the agency (and any subcontractor thereof at any tier) required to be present at a covered worksite;

(ii) contact-tracing at covered worksites, including procedures by which such employees and contractors (and any subcontractor thereof at any tier) will be notified of a potential exposure to an individual who is diagnosed with COVID-19; and

(iii) administering the COVID-19 vaccine to employees of the agency.

(2) Guidance on—

(A) any cleaning protocols to be implemented at covered worksites;

(B) occupancy limits for covered worksites; and

(C) the use of appropriate face coverings by employees of the agency and contractors of the agency (and any subcontractor thereof at any tier) while physically present at a covered worksite.

(3) A description of the actions the agency is or will be taking to protect from exposure to COVID-19 employees of the agency who conduct activities in an official capacity while not physically present at a covered worksite, including employees of the agency—

(A) who are required to travel in an official capacity; or

(B) perform audits or inspections.

(4) A description of any requirements that members of the public are required to meet in order to enter a facility in which covered worksites are located.

(5) A description of any alternative option to being physically present at a covered worksite that are available for employees who—

(A) have a high risk of contracting COVID-19 (as determined by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention); or

(B) live in a household with individuals that have a high risk of contracting COVID-19 (as determined by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention).

(6) A description of any rule or protocol regarding whether employees of the agency required to be physically present at covered worksites are—

(A) required to be fully vaccinated before being present at covered worksites; or

(B) allowed to take leave—

(i) to get each dose of the vaccine; or

(ii) upon experiencing severe side-effects as a result of receiving any dose of such vaccine.

(7) Protocols that ensure the continuity of operations, including a plan to reverse any requirement for an employee or contractor (or subcontractor thereof at any tier) to be present at a facility in which covered worksites are located if there is a surge in

COVID-19 cases in the geographic area of such facility.

(8) The hotline website and hotline telephone number of the Inspector General of the agency for employees of the agency and contractors of the agency (and any subcontractor thereof at any tier) to report to the Inspector General any instance in which the agency is not implementing the plan required by this section.

(c) **DELAYED APPLICABILITY FOR CERTAIN WORKSITES.**—For any worksite that the head of the agency has temporarily closed due to COVID-19, the requirements of subsection (a) shall be carried out not later than 30 days before any employee of the agency or contractor of any agency (or any subcontractor thereof at any tier) is required to be physically present at such worksite.

(d) **INSPECTORS GENERAL REPORTS.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of each agency shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate a report on whether that agency—

(1) has published and communicated the public safety plan required by subsection (a), in accordance with such subsection; and

(2) implemented such plan.

(e) **APPLICATION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to alter or otherwise limit the rights and obligations afforded under chapter 71 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **AGENCY.**—The term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) **COVERED PERIOD.**—The term “covered period” means the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date on which the public health emergency declared by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under section 319 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247) as a result of the COVID-19, or any renewal thereof, terminates.

(3) **COVERED WORKSITE.**—The term “covered worksite” means a worksite at which an employee of the agency or a contractor of the agency (or subcontractor thereof at any tier) is required to be present during the covered period.

(4) **WORKSITE.**—The term “worksite” means—

(A) in the case of an employee of the agency, the location of the employee’s position of record where the employee regularly performs his or her duties, but does not include any location where the employee teleworks (as that term is defined in section 6501 of title 5, United States Code); and

(B) in the case of a contractor of the agency (or subcontractor thereof at any tier), the location in a facility of the agency where the contractor or subcontractor performs his or her duties under a contract with the agency, or a subcontract thereof at any tier, as applicable.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania

(Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the measure before us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 978 would require Federal agencies to establish protocols and protections to ensure the health and safety of Federal employees upon returning to their regular workstations.

Each agency would be responsible for posting its policy on its website and properly notifying employees of the procedures within 60 days of enactment or 30 days before a closed worksite reopens.

Within 6 months, the inspector general of each agency must submit to Congress a review on implementation and communication of the procedures.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill, which is named in honor of one of Representative CONNOLLY’s constituents, a Federal employee, who died tragically of coronavirus in May of last year.

Federal employees both here in Washington, D.C., and across the country have been on the front lines of the government response to the coronavirus pandemic from the beginning.

As more are preparing to return to their regular worksites, this legislation will help make sure that policies are clearly conveyed to employees so that return happens safely.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill, and I urge Members to vote “yes.”

Mr. KELLER. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express sincere condolences to the family of Mr. Suthammanont.

The global COVID-19 pandemic has meant painful losses for many families across America.

I want to thank my colleague, Mr. CONNOLLY, for his work on this bill.

Discussing this legislation is a reminder as to how precious life is. Every loss impacts a community and the surviving family members.

Over the past year-and-a-half, the COVID-19 pandemic has extraordinarily challenged our Nation. For example, the pandemic presented unprecedented workforce challenges for the Federal Government. Every State and territory were under a historically unprecedented emergency declaration and sought assistance from Federal agencies.

Both the Trump and Biden administrations have issued numerous guid-

ance materials to Federal agencies to ensure the vital work of America’s Government could continue in a safe manner.

This bill is well intentioned, and I support government-wide transparency to the American people and the Federal workforce. But the reality is, I feel that this bill is creating unnecessary and duplicative paperwork requirements.

Both the Trump and Biden administrations publicly released much of the information this bill seeks to obtain, and the Biden administration continues to require the current planning the bill seeks.

Further, putting restrictive reporting requirements on agencies may hinder the new administration’s ability to bring the Federal workforce back to work rapidly as it is determined safe to do so. I have concerns that it may be duplicating existing efforts of the Federal Government.

We hope to continue working together with our colleagues across the aisle to make sure the Federal Government is effectively delivering necessary resources and services to the American people in a safe manner.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), my good friend and colleague.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and neighbor, the Congresswoman from the District of Columbia for her work, and I also thank the Republican manager for his kind remarks about a grieving family in my district.

Last year, I brought a similar version of this bill to the floor requiring Federal agencies to communicate safety plans to their employees before returning to their offices. It is not an extra layer of paperwork; it is a plan. You have just got to have a plan so that we don’t have more people like Chai Suthammanont dying from COVID. It seems to me that is something we ought to come together on, on a bipartisan basis.

While our country opens for business, COVID-19 cases and hospitalizations that had been declining just a month ago are again on the rise, and the dangerous delta variant accounts for 83 percent of those cases in the United States.

Meanwhile, only 56.3 percent of the total U.S. population has had at least one dose of the vaccine, and in 16 States, fewer than 50 percent of the population has had at least one dose, including, I believe, the State of the distinguished Republican manager today.

We are clearly not out of the woods, and we must look to ensure the safety of both of our Federal workforce and our contract Federal workforce as they return to the workplace.

The Chai Suthammanont Remembrance Act would require every Federal

agency to prepare and communicate a safety plan for how to do that.

The plan would include descriptions of the personal protective equipment that the agency will provide to its on-site employees and contractors; guidance of other mitigation efforts; protections for employees whose work requires them to travel offsite; testing, contact tracing, if necessary, and vaccination protocols; and procedures that ensure the continuity of operations in the event it is necessary to reverse on-site requirements.

The bill would also require every agency's inspector general to report on whether the agency has published and implemented a safety plan consistent with CDC guidelines.

We should not be looking to rush Federal employees back to offices no matter what the cost, because that cost is too high. Already, two of our colleagues in this body, who have been vaccinated, have contracted the delta variant, apparently, of COVID-19. People are at risk.

The man for whom this bill is named tragically lost his life in May of 2020. He was an immigrant from Thailand, who came here at the age of 17. He built a life as a man known for helping others.

Even in retirement, Chai's call to service brought him to work as a Federal employee at the Marine Corps Community Services Child Development Center in Quantico, Virginia. He worked to prepare meals for the children of our Marines. He developed a unique handshake for every kid at the daycare, making every child feel special and included.

On April 27, 2020, Chai worked his last full shift at the daycare kitchen as one of his coworkers coughed repeatedly and looked very ill. The problem was there were no protocols in place. That person subsequently tested positive.

□ 1645

A month later, after 13 days on a ventilator, my constituent, Chai, lost his life unnecessarily, because there was no plan. There were no protocols.

This bill would prevent that. This bill will save lives. I plead with my friends on the other side of the aisle, please let's not make this a political pawn.

For the sake of Chai, his surviving widow, his family, his loved ones, his colleagues at the Marine base at Quantico, can we not do the right thing?

I could talk a lot about the need for this, Mr. Speaker. I could talk more about Chai and his family, but I rest on the hope and belief that today on this matter we will hear the better angels of our nature and make sure that no more Chais have to die because of a lack of protocol and the lack of a plan simply to protect the workforce in the Federal workplace.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to request a roll call vote on this bill, but I am concerned that it may be duplicating existing efforts of the Federal Government. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 978, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

PERFORMANCE ENHANCEMENT REFORM ACT

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2617) to amend section 1115 of title 31, United States Code, to amend the description of how performance goals are achieved, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2617

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Performance Enhancement Reform Act".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT.

Section 1115 of title 31, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (b)(5) to read as follows:

"(5) provide a description of how the performance goals are to be achieved, including—

"(A) the human capital, training, data and evidence, information technology, and skill sets required to meet the performance goals;

"(B) the technology modernization investments, system upgrades, staff technology skills and expertise, stakeholder input and feedback, and other resources and strategies needed and required to meet the performance goals;

"(C) clearly defined milestones;

"(D) an identification of the organizations, program activities, regulations, policies, operational processes, and other activities that contribute to each performance goal, both within and external to the agency;

"(E) a description of how the agency is working with other agencies and the organizations identified in subparagraph (D) to measure and achieve its performance goals as well as relevant Federal Government performance goals; and

"(F) an identification of the agency officials responsible for the achievement of each performance goal, who shall be known as goal leaders;" and

(2) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

"(g) PREPARATION OF PERFORMANCE PLAN.—The Chief Performance Improvement Office (or the functional equivalent) shall collaborate with the Chief Human Capital Officer (or the functional equivalent), the Chief Information Officer (or the functional equivalent), the Chief Data Officer (or the functional equivalent), and the Chief Financial Officer (or the functional equivalent) to prepare that portion of the annual performance plan described under subsection (b)(5).".

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 2617.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Performance Enhancement Reform Act, introduced by Government Operations subcommittee chair GERRY CONNOLLY and Ranking Member JODY HICE, builds on the Government Performance and Reform Act of 1993. That law requires Federal agencies to develop 5-year strategic plans and annual performance plans and reports.

The law was updated in 2010 to require greater involvement by the Office of Management and Budget to incorporate governmentwide priority goals and to improve accountability by requiring agencies to publish these plans and reports online.

The Performance Enhancement Reform Act would require the development of a more comprehensive annual performance plan through collaboration between senior agency leaders, including chief human capital officers, chief performance officers, chief information officers, and the chief financial officer.

The bill would also require agency performance plans to include descriptions of any skill set the agency needs to meet its performance goals. This would be an important reform to identify any gaps in expertise or resources an agency must address to accomplish its goals.

This commonsense, bipartisan measure will enhance agency management and strengthen the focus on achieving the agencies' missions.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2617, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Performance Enhancement Reform Act would require proper agency collaboration with annual agency performance planning.

This bill directly addresses a problem where Federal agency technology and data resources sometimes struggle to support agency operational workflow and programmatic goals.

It recognizes the reality that agency leadership must directly involve their technology and data leaders in strategic planning.

Under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 and the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010, Federal agencies are required to create annual performance plans.

The Performance Enhancement Reform Act puts the agency chief performance improvement officers in charge of coordinating the annual agency performance goals.

The bill will also make sure that the agency's performance planning process considers the resources necessary to support operations and achieve mission success.

Such resources include information technology capabilities, supporting data assets, and human workforce capacity and skills.

It also directly ensures that during this annual planning, the agency chief information officers, chief data officers, and chief financial officers are consulted on whether the performance goals are realistic and proper resources exist.

I want to recognize my colleagues, Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. HICE, for their work crafting this smart legislation in the House Oversight Committee.

Agencies should be committing to goals that have a real chance of succeeding, and this legislation requires the proper coordination to make that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from District of Columbia, and I thank Mr. KELLER, the Republican manager, for his kind words and his support.

Current law requires Federal agencies to develop a performance plan every year that defines the agency's mission, summarizes strategic goals and objectives, and identifies strategies to achieve them.

Agencies use that plan to align resources and guide decision-making to accomplish priorities and improve outcomes.

These performance plans should support planning across organizational operating units and describe how agency

components are working together toward common results that serve the public.

They should inform agency decision-making about the need for major new acquisitions, strategic human capital planning, evaluations, and other evidence-building and evidence-capacity building investments.

Moreover, the performance plans can also stimulate innovation to advance agency goals.

With such a broad and robust purpose, these plans should be prepared collaboratively by agency leadership using the best available data and evidence to form a strong foundation from which to execute agency missions.

Current law, however, requires only the chief human capital officer to contribute to the creation of this performance plan. Current law does not require agencies to incorporate data and evidence or information technology solutions into their performance plans. In the 21st century.

These narrow requirements overlook the invaluable expertise of key stakeholders and crucial resources in the formation of agency plans and exclude a critical area of agency planning.

For example, chief information officers must identify and plan for an agency's IT needs.

IT is critical to mission delivery at every agency. Missions are threatened by outdated legacy systems, software, and hardware, to say nothing of their being cyber insecure.

CIOs deserve a seat at the table to engage in performance planning that drives meaningful IT modernization so agencies can provide the critical services upon which the American public relies. The pandemic has certainly made that clear.

Current law exacerbates the lack of collaboration that plagues leadership in many Federal agencies and stymies successful IT modernization.

The Performance Enhancement Reform Act requires agencies to integrate IT modernization and evidence metrics more effectively into their performance plans and gives the CIO a seat at the table.

The bill requires agency performance plans to include descriptions of human capital, training, data and evidence, IT, and skill sets needed for the agency to meet its performance goals.

Finally, the bill requires performance plans to include descriptions of technology modernization investments, system upgrades, staff technology skills and expertise needed, stakeholder input and feedback, and other resources and strategies.

As the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia mentioned in her opening remarks, this is a bipartisan bill. My ranking member, Mr. HICE from Georgia, collaborated with us fully in trying to get to this point.

This is a good government measure. I certainly commend it to all of our colleagues. If we approve this, we will

take a giant leap forward in trying to modernize performance planning for every Federal agency to serve the American public better.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Speaker, this bill would ensure the creation of more realistic capability- and resource-based agency performance goals.

I urge my colleagues to support this smart government reform bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of H.R. 2617, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2617, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL CYBER DIRECTOR TO ACCEPT DETAILS ON NONREIMBURSABLE BASIS

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 2382) to authorize the National Cyber Director to accept details from other elements of the Federal Government on nonreimbursable basis, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2382

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY FOR NATIONAL CYBER DIRECTOR TO ACCEPT DETAILS ON NONREIMBURSABLE BASIS.

Section 1752(e) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (8) as subparagraphs (A) through (H), respectively, and indenting such subparagraphs two ems to the right;

(2) in the matter before subparagraph (A), as redesignated by paragraph (1), by striking “The Director may” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director may”;

(3) in paragraph (1)—

(A) as redesignated by paragraph (2), by redesignating subparagraphs (C) through (H) as subparagraphs (D) through (I), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph (C):

“(C) accept officers or employees of the United States or member of the Armed Forces on a detail from an element of the intelligence community or from another element of the Federal Government on a nonreimbursable basis, as jointly agreed to by the

heads of the receiving and detailing elements, for a period not to exceed three years;"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION REGARDING DETAILS.—Paragraph (1)(C) shall not be construed to impose any limitation on any other authority for reimbursable or nonreimbursable details. A nonreimbursable detail made under such paragraph shall not be considered an augmentation of the appropriations of the receiving element of the Office of the National Cyber Director."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials on S. 2382.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia?

There was no objection.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of S. 2382, which would allow the National Cyber Director to accept details from other elements of the Federal Government as on a nonreimbursable basis.

Last year the Committee on Oversight and Reform helped advance legislation to establish the Office of the National Cyber Director in the Executive Office of the President. The bipartisan effort fulfilled a key recommendation of the U.S. Cyberspace Solarium Commission, which was established by the 2019 National Defense Authorization Act to review the condition of our Nation's cybersecurity posture and to develop solutions to defend against cyber threats.

□ 1700

The National Cyber Director Act was signed into law through last year's National Defense Authorization Act, creating a centralized cybersecurity position in the White House to assist in the development and streamlining of the Federal Government's strategy, coordination, and response to cyber threats.

We were thrilled to see President Biden nominate and the Senate confirm Chris Inglis, a widely-respected member of the Solarium Commission, as the Nation's first National Cyber Director. Now, Mr. Inglis needs a team to get to work immediately to address cybersecurity, which remains one of the most urgent threats on the Government Accountability Office's high-risk list.

Indeed, the State and non-state actors from Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and all corners of the globe are waging a silent war capable of shutting down our critical infrastructure, breaching our sensitive information

system, and jeopardizing critical sectors in America and globally.

Until Congress acts to provide the Office of the National Cyber Director its first appropriation, the Office requires the ability to bring in details on a non-reimbursable basis. This bill would grant that authority.

Cyberattacks are critical, widespread, complex, and escalating as a threat to our national and economic security. A challenge as grave and pervasive as cybersecurity requires that our government be strategic, organized, and ready. It is imperative that we pass this bill immediately to allow the Office of the National Cyber Director to get up running as it awaits its full appropriation.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the National Cyber Director, or NCD, is a recently congressionally authorized position for coordinating our Nation's cyber infrastructure and activities located within the Executive Office of the President. According to the Biden administration's statutory interpretation of the NCD's authorizing statute, Chris Inglis, the newly designated National Cyber Director, cannot staff his office with qualified talent on loan from other Federal agencies.

The administration has determined that the NCD's authorizing statute does not provide the necessary authority to accept nonreimbursable detailees from other Federal agencies. Congress intended the NCD to be able to use details to staff his office.

The NCD's authorizing statute gives power to the Director to utilize, with their consent, the services, personnel, and facilities of other Federal agencies, even voluntary and uncompensated services. But the administration is preventing the NCD from accepting Federal details while congressional appropriations are also pending.

S. 2382 will help clarify the NCD's authority to accept Federal details for a period not to exceed 3 years, and will help this new office properly staff itself in the immediate months ahead.

We recognize the importance of helping this new office stand up its operations during a time when the Nation deals with cyberattacks. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 2382. As the author of the National Cyber Director Act, I commend Senators PORTMAN and PETERS for offering this important legislation to clarify the authorities of this new office.

I said it before and I will say it again: Cybersecurity is the national and eco-

nomic security challenge of the 21st century. For 30 years we have been increasing the number of connected devices, processes, and services connected to the internet at an exponential rate. We can now instantly communicate with people half a world away and use data repositories to drive advances in medicine, clean energy, and commerce. With this connectivity comes vulnerability.

For these three decades, the United States has struggled to develop a coherent cybersecurity strategy and to implement it to better protect the country and cyberspace. While we have seen the results of this failure in breaches ranging from the devastating, the tens of billions of dollars in damage caused by, for example, NotPetty, to the mundane, as companies fend off daily cyber probes.

Just in the last half century we have witnessed the Russian Government target us through ransomware attacks through SolarWinds; the Chinese Government break into instances of the Microsoft Exchange Server, and criminals wreak havoc on the Colonial Pipeline, JBS, and customers of Kaseya through ransomware attacks, so we are not where we need to be.

Congress recognized this fact in 2018 when it created the Cyberspace Solarium Commission, a distinguished body that I had the privilege of being appointed to by Speaker PELOSI. Through a year of deliberation, we developed a strategy of layered cyber deterrence, and had more than 80 recommendations to make that strategy a reality. Those recommendations run the gamut from changes to our military to regulations on private companies. But underlying all of them is the recognition that the U.S. Government itself is still not organized for success.

Now enter the National Cyber Director. This key recommendation called for a Senate-confirmed leader within the Executive Office of the President with the policy and budgetary authority to develop a national strategy, oversee its implementation, and coordinate response to significant cyber incidents.

With the help of Congressman GALLAGHER, the Solarium Commission's co-chair, and through the leadership of Chairwoman CAROLYN MALONEY and her staff, my National Cyber Director Act made it into last year's NDAA. Earlier this month, the President had appointed and the Senate confirmed our inaugural National Cyber Director, my fellow Solarium Commission member, Chris Inglis, to take office as the first Director.

Chris' confirmation represents nothing less than a sea change in how the government will coordinate cyberspace policy. Once this office is fully staffed up, there will be a well of expertise within the White House to ensure that the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, sector risk management agencies, the United States Cyber

Command, the intelligence community, and all of the other disparate elements of the government are working in concert to improve our cybersecurity. However, the Office of the National Cyber Director is very much a startup at the moment.

While we will be voting on a full budget for this office later this week, including, I hope, an amendment to provide the full \$25 million yearlong appropriation recommended by the Solarium Commission, we can't wait until the full fiscal year 2022 budget is passed to get Director Inglis on his feet and up and running.

After all, our adversaries certainly aren't constrained by our budgetary calendar. In drafting the bill, we anticipated that the NCD might need to call upon the personnel, facilities, or services of Federal departments and agencies, with their permission, of course. However, there seems to be some ambiguity within the White House about whether this includes the ability of the Office to accept the services of nonreimbursable detailees.

While I think the language and the congressional intent of the original statute are quite clear, this bill should clear up any misunderstanding once and for all by explicitly authorizing nonreimbursable detailees. This legislation will help Director Inglis get a staff vanguard in place and ensure he and his successors can take advantage of the expertise resident at the various agencies that contribute to our success in cyberspace.

Mr. Speaker, let me again thank Senators PORTMAN and PETERS and Chairwoman MALONEY for moving so quickly to address this urgent issue. Congress has already shown tremendous support for this Office, and I think the speed at which this bill moves is a testament to our commitment to its success.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support S. 2382.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to do the same. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 2382.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mrs. GREENE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

DISPOSE OF UNUSED MEDICATIONS AND PRESCRIPTION OPIOIDS ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 957) to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to ensure that certain medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs have physical locations for the disposal of controlled substances medications.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 957

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF PERIODS DURING WHICH ANY INDIVIDUAL MAY DISPOSE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES MEDICATIONS AT FACILITIES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

Section 3009 of the Johnny Isakson and David P. Roe, M.D. Veterans Health Care and Benefits Improvement Act of 2020 (Public Law 116-315; 38 U.S.C. 8110 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and
(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection (b):

“(b) DESIGNATION OF PERIODS FOR ANY INDIVIDUAL TO DISPOSE OF MEDICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall designate periods during which any individual may dispose of controlled substances medications at a covered Department medical facility.

“(2) PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGNS.—The Secretary may carry out public information campaigns regarding the periods designated under paragraph (1).”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on S. 957.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are bringing up to the floor Senator KENNEDY's bill, S. 957, the DUMP Opioids Act. I also want to commend Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS and Congressman TRONE for their work in introducing a House companion to this legislation.

We have all seen reports of a dramatic increase in accidental and intentional overdose deaths during the pandemic, both among veterans and non-veterans, in our communities. While addressing the factors that lead to substance misuse, we must also act immediately to lower access to controlled substances for those in distress.

I applaud my colleagues for advancing this legislation as one piece in our

lethal means safety approach to suicide and accidental death prevention.

The Department of Veterans Affairs has been a leader in decreasing prescribing of opioids and in developing nonopioid forms of pain management. This is vitally important given what we know about the health risks that even prescription opioids pose for veterans and others in our Nation.

At the same time, chronic pain is a challenging, significant, and ongoing concern for many veterans and there are times when opioids are appropriately prescribed and monitored. We need to make sure, however, that people have safe ways to dispose of opioid medications when they are either no longer needed or when they could be used unsafely in a home. This bill ensures that veterans and members of the public may safely dispose of unused controlled substances in special repositories on VA properties on days specifically designated by VA as public take-back days.

The Secretary of the VA has the authority to set appropriate guidelines for safe disposal by members of the public.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the DUMP Opioids Act, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1715

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 957, the Dispose of Unused Medications and Prescription Opioids Act, or the DUMP Opioids Act.

Last year, Congress passed legislation that would allow veterans to dispose of excess prescription medications at VA medical facilities. The DUMP Opioids Act would allow nonveterans to do the same thing. It would also authorize a VA education campaign to make veterans and nonveterans alike aware of their ability to dispose of leftover medication at the VA.

This bill is sponsored in the Senate by Senator KENNEDY and in the House by Congresswoman MILLER-MEEKS. I am grateful to both of them for their leadership and advocacy on this important issue.

Earlier this month, CDC released data showing that opioid overdose deaths surged throughout the pandemic. In 2020, more than 93,000 Americans died of an overdose. This is an almost 30 percent increase from 2019.

We have to do everything we can to help those suffering from substance abuse disorder to overcome their addiction. One way we can do this is by making controlled substances less readily available. By making it easier for unused opioids and other prescription medication to be disposed of, this bill would help do that.

I hope that every Member will join me in supporting the DUMP Opioids Act.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Iowa (Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS), my good friend.

Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of Senator JOHN KENNEDY's Dispose of Unused Medications and Prescription Opioids Act, S. 957, or the DUMP Opioids Act.

Earlier this year, President Trump signed the JOHNNY ISAKSON and DAVID P. ROE, M.D. Veterans Health Care and Benefits Improvement Act into law. Under this law, the VA is required to set up prescription drop boxes on VA campuses so that veterans can safely dispose of unused and excess controlled substance medications. The DUMP Opioids Act directs the Secretary of the VA to designate periods during which anyone, not just veterans, may dispose of unused medications at VA facilities.

In April, I partnered with Congressman DAVID TRONE to introduce the House companion to Senator KENNEDY's bill, and I am proud to see this bill before the House today.

As a doctor, I have seen firsthand the challenges created by opioid addiction and abuse. The opioid epidemic has hit every corner of the United States, and all of us know someone who has been harmed by addiction.

The DUMP Opioids Act is a simple expansion of current law that will give more Americans access to safe opioid disposal sites. Congress must work in a bipartisan manner and give our constituents the tools they need to tackle this head-on.

America has been hit hard by the opioid epidemic for years, especially over this past year during the pandemic, as illustrated by my colleague from Illinois. Iowa is no exception.

With opioid-related deaths up 35 percent in Iowa over the last year, we need to be more focused than ever on our efforts to both treat and prevent addiction. As a physician, I am proud to do my part to help combat this crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Senator KENNEDY for his work with this bill, and I urge all of my colleagues to support S. 957, the DUMP Opioids Act.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in passing S. 957, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill as well, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 957.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2021

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1910) to authorize major medical facility projects of the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2021.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1910

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Major Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF MAJOR MEDICAL FACILITY PROJECTS OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may carry out the following major medical facility projects in fiscal year 2021 at the locations specified and in an amount for each project not to exceed the amount specified for such location:

(1) Construction of an outpatient clinic and national cemetery in Alameda, California, in an amount not to exceed \$266,200,000.

(2) Construction of a new specialty care building 201 in American Lake, Washington, in an amount not to exceed \$110,600,000.

(3) Construction of a community living center and renovation of domiciliary and outpatient facilities in Canandaigua, New York, in an amount not to exceed \$383,741,000.

(4) Construction of a spinal cord injury center in Dallas, Texas, in an amount not to exceed \$249,000,000.

(5) Realignment and closure of the Livermore Campus in Livermore, California, in an amount not to exceed \$455,000,000.

(6) Seismic corrections to the mental health and community living center in Long Beach, California, in an amount not to exceed \$367,300,000.

(7) Construction of a spinal cord injury building with a community living center, including a parking garage, in San Diego, California, in an amount not to exceed \$252,100,000.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2021 or the year in which funds are appropriated for the Construction, Major Projects account, \$2,083,941,000 for the projects authorized in subsection (a).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on S. 1910.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Senator TESTER's S. 1910, the Major Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2021. I also thank my good friend and a valued member of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Representative COLIN ALLRED, for introducing the House companion to this vital and important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, each year, the Department of Veterans Affairs submits an annual budget request to Congress, and then it is our job to authorize and appropriate the funding that VA needs to care for America's veterans and their families. Within that larger funding request is VA's request for funds to replace and modernize its medical facilities.

This year's major construction request totals just over \$2 billion and will build a much-needed spinal cord injury center in Dallas, Texas; erect a community living center and renovate domiciliary and outpatient facilities in Canandaigua, New York; construct an outpatient clinic and a national cemetery in Alameda, California; and allow for the construction of a new specialty care building in American Lake, Washington, among other things.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress, our committee has highlighted VA's aging infrastructure. It might surprise some Members to learn the median age of VA medical centers is 58 years old. In the private sector, it is about 11 years.

Delivering 21st century healthcare in buildings that were built during the latter half of the 19th century is far from ideal and certainly not what our veterans deserve.

Despite outdated facilities, RAND and other academic entities have found VA provides better care than private options, in most cases. That is right. The VA provides better care even though it is working from outdated facilities. Imagine what those findings would look like if VA was competing with a modern infrastructure.

During our oversight efforts, the committee has learned that in order to fully recapitalize the Department's portfolio, VA would need roughly \$100 billion. The Biden administration's \$18 billion proposal to enhance VA's physical infrastructure is a downpayment in ensuring veterans have access to the most advanced healthcare and most robust infrastructure that we can provide.

My colleagues across the aisle may argue that potentially spending \$18 billion on VA's infrastructure is premature because it fails to consider existing reform efforts already underway, alluding to the AIR Commission. They will argue that we should wait for the Commission's findings. Given the severity of underfunding as it relates to VA's capital assets, we cannot afford to

wait until the AIR Commission provides recommendations to Congress and the White House.

Life safety and seismic issues across the portfolio must be addressed now. Regular maintenance should not be delayed because of budgetary concerns, nor should we delay retrofitting facilities to meet the needs of VA's fastest growing population—women veterans—or delay addressing the lessons learned from this Nation's first pandemic in more than 100 years.

If we are going to build back better, if we are going to build back trust in VA, we have to start making serious investments in the outdated infrastructure meant to serve them, and nearly three-fourths of Americans agree.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I support S. 1910, and I thank Senator TESTER, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for prioritizing and passing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1910, the Major Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2021.

This bill would authorize the VA's major medical facilities construction projects in California, Washington, New York, and Texas. Those projects include outpatient clinics, a specialty care building, a spinal cord injury center, two community living centers, and more.

These projects are formally requested by the VA in the most recent budget submission. They would benefit hundreds, if not thousands, of veterans.

This bill is sponsored by Senator JON TESTER, chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee. I thank him for introducing it, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting it today.

The VA healthcare system has a massive capital assets profile. It is comprised of medical facilities that are, on average, more than five times older than private-sector medical facilities.

In 2018, Congress passed the Asset and Infrastructure Review Act, or the AIR Act, to bring the VA healthcare system into the 21st century. It would lay the foundation to modernize the VA medical facilities to better serve the veterans.

I am proud to support this bill to help deliver updated medical facilities to the veterans in these four States, but we have much more to do to deliver modern medical care to our veterans across this country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that we can pass this bill today and then continue working together to ensure the AIR Act lives up to the immense promises that it has for the veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ALLRED), my good friend and a member of the

House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, where he is an active member of the Subcommittee on Health.

(Mr. ALLRED asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLRED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bipartisan bill, the fiscal year 2021 Major Medical Facility Authorization Act.

As the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq come to an end, as a Nation, we are reminded of our profound and sacred commitment to ensure that each and every one of our veterans gets the support, services, and care they need when they return home.

We owe this commitment to every generation of veterans who have served. I know this from when I visited Afghanistan in 2019 as a member of this committee.

Whether it is exposure to toxic air, coping with the stress and mental toll of their service, or trying to find a good job as they transition back to civilian life, we must do all we can to support our veterans who have served us so well.

That is why I was proud to lead this bipartisan bill in the House. This bill would create jobs by authorizing the construction of several major VA medical facilities across the country, including a spinal cord injury center in Dallas, my hometown and just outside of my district.

The Dallas project, currently underway, will construct a 30-bed, long-term care spinal cord injury center with the capacity to expand to 60 beds. These funds will ensure this center has all the tools it needs to best serve veterans in its care, including a warehouse administration building, parking garage, and central plant improvements.

In addition to providing long-term care for the medical complications of spinal cord injuries and disorders, the center will provide a residential setting in which highly dependent or medically complex veterans could live on a long-term basis, receiving the specialized environment, staff skills, and equipment that they require.

In 2020, I worked with folks in both parties to help secure a new VA hospital in Garland, in my district. This was a vacant hospital that we were able to get donated to the VA system. It took months and months of meetings and calls, but we were able to get it done. It has now been up and running for over a year, and the folks there are doing extraordinary work. It proves that when we provide the VA with the resources it needs, the hardworking folks there will go above and beyond to serve our veterans.

The facility is expected to eventually create 5,000 jobs and is helping us to better serve 174,000 veterans in north Texas.

Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to keep building on this work with the passage of this bill because, like our veterans' service and sacrifice, our commitment to them must be sacred.

I thank my House cosponsors, Representatives DEREK KILMER, KIM SCHRIER, and MIKE LEVIN. I also thank Chairman TAKANO and Ranking Member BOST for their leadership on this bill. I thank the Senate leads, Senator JON TESTER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and Senator JERRY MORAN as well.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in passing S. 1910, the Major Medical Facility Authorization Act of 2021, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. TAKANO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1910.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion are postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. PINGREE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO SELECT COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE JANUARY 6TH ATTACK ON THE UNITED STATES CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to section 2 of House Resolution 503, 117th Congress, and the order of the House of January 4, 2021, of the following Member to the Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol:

Mr. KINZINGER, Illinois

RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, I rise to a question of the privileges of the House, and I send to the desk a privileged resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 554

Whereas, on June 30, 2021, the House voted to establish a “Select Committee to Investigate the January 6th Attack on the United States Capitol.”;

Whereas, H. Res. 503 states that “The Speaker shall appoint 13 Members to the Select Committee, 5 of whom shall be appointed after consultation with the Minority Leader.”;

Whereas, on June 30, 2021, Speaker Nancy Pelosi stated that “We believe that Congress must in the spirit of bipartisanship and patriotism establish this commission.”;

Whereas, when asked during a press conference on July 22 about the partisanship of the committee, Speaker Pelosi stated that “the less partisan it is, the more it will be accepted by the American people.”;

Whereas, in a statement put out by the Speaker's Office, Speaker Pelosi stated that “our imperative must be to find the truth. We must do so in a way that retains the trust of the American people in the proceedings, so that they will have confidence in the truth that emerges.”;

Whereas, for the first known time in the history of the House, the Speaker of the House rejected two of the Minority Leader's nominees to a Select Committee.;

Whereas, Speaker Pelosi's own press release acknowledged that this was an “unprecedented decision.”; and

Whereas, Speaker Pelosi's refusal to seat all five Republican Members directly harms the legitimacy, credibility, and integrity of the proceedings of the Select Committee: : Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the refusal of Speaker Nancy Pelosi to seat all five Republican Members to the Select Committee; and

(2) urges the Speaker to make the following appointments to the Select Committee: Representative Jim Banks of Indiana, Representative Jim Jordan of Ohio, Representative Rodney Davis of Illinois, Representative Kelly Armstrong of North Dakota, and Representative Troy Nehls of Texas.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution qualifies.

MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hoyer moves that the resolution be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 197, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 219]

YEAS—218

Adams	Allred	Axne
Aguilar	Auchincloss	Barragán

Bass	Green, Al (TX)	Pallone
Beatty	Grijalva	Panetta
Bera	Harder (CA)	Pappas
Beyer	Hayes	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Higgins (NY)	Payne
Blumenauer	Himes	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Horsford	Peters
Bonamici	Houlahan	Phillips
Bourdeaux	Hoyer	Pingree
Bowman	Huffman	Pocan
Boyle, Brendan	Jackson Lee	Porter
F.	Jacobs (CA)	Pressley
Brown	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Brownley	Jeffries	Quigley
Bush	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Bustos	Johnson (TX)	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Jones	Ross
Carbajal	Kabele	Roybal-Allard
Cardenas	Kaptur	Ruiz
Carson	Keating	Ruppersberger
Carter (LA)	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Cartwright	Khanna	Ryan
Casten	Kildee	Sanchez
Castor (FL)	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Castro (TX)	Kim (NJ)	Scanlon
Cheney	Kind	Schakowsky
Chu	Kinzinger	Schiff
Cicilline	Kirkpatrick	Schneider
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Schrier
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Lamb	Scott, David
Clyburn	Langevin	Sewell
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sherrill
Cooper	Lawrence	Sires
Correa	Lawson (FL)	Slotkin
Costa	Lee (CA)	Smith (WA)
Courtney	Lee (NV)	Soto
Craig	Leger Fernandez	Spanberger
Crist	Levin (CA)	Speier
Crow	Levin (MI)	Stansbury
Cuellar	Lieu	Stanton
Davids (KS)	Lofgren	Stevens
Davis, Danny K.	Luria	Strickland
Dean	Lynch	Suozzi
DeFazio	Malinowski	Swalwell
DeGette	Maloney,	Takano
DeLauro	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
DelBene	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Delgado	Manning	Titus
Demings	Matsui	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	McBath	Tonko
Deutch	McCollum	Torres (CA)
Dingell	McEachin	Torres (NY)
Doggett	McGovern	Trahan
Doyle, Michael	McNerney	Trone
F.	Meeks	Underwood
Escobar	Meng	Vargas
Eshoo	Mfume	Veasey
Espallat	Moore (WI)	Vela
Evans	Morelle	Velázquez
Fletcher	Moulton	Wasserman
Foster	Mrvan	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Gallego	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Napolitano	Welch
Garcia (IL)	Neal	Wexton
Garcia (TX)	Neguse	Wild
Golden	Newman	Williams (GA)
Gomez	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Gonzalez,	O'Halleran	Yarmuth
Gonzalez,	Ocasio-Cortez	
Vicente	Omar	
Gottheimer		

NAYS—197

Aderholt	Burgess	Fallon
Allen	Calvert	Feenstra
Amodei	Cammack	Ferguson
Armstrong	Carl	Fischbach
Arrington	Carter (GA)	Fitzgerald
Babin	Carter (TX)	Fitzpatrick
Bacon	Cawthorn	Fleischmann
Baird	Chabot	Fortenberry
Balderson	Cline	Fox
Banks	Cloud	Franklin, C.
Barr	Clyde	Scott
Bentz	Cole	Fulcher
Bergman	Comer	Gaetz
Bice (OK)	Crawford	Gallagher
Biggs	Crenshaw	Garbarino
Bilirakis	Curtis	Garcia (CA)
Bishop (NC)	Davidson	Gibbs
Boebert	DesJarlais	Gimenez
Bost	Diaz-Balart	Gohmert
Brady	Donalds	Gonzales, Tony
Brooks	Duncan	Gonzalez (OH)
Buchanan	Dunn	Good (VA)
Bucshon	Emmer	Gooden (TX)
Burchett	Estes	Gosar

Granger	Lucas	Rosendale
Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer
Graves (MO)	Mace	Roy
Green (TN)	Malliotakis	Rutherford
Greene (GA)	Mann	Salazar
Griffith	Massie	Scalise
Grothman	McCarthy	Schweikert
Guthrie	McCaul	Sessions
Harris	McClain	Smith (MO)
Harshbarger	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Hartzler	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Hern	McKinley	Smucker
Herrell	Meijer	Spartz
Herrera Beutler	Meuser	Staubert
Hice (GA)	Miller (IL)	Steel
Hill	Miller (WV)	Stefanik
Hinson	Miller-Meeks	Steil
Hollingsworth	Moolenaar	Steube
Hudson	Mooney	Stewart
Huizenga	Moore (AL)	Taylor
Issa	Moore (UT)	Tenney
Jackson	Mullin	Thompson (PA)
Jacobs (NY)	Murphy (NC)	Tiffany
Johnson (LA)	Nehls	Timmons
Johnson (OH)	Newhouse	Turner
Johnson (SD)	Norman	Upton
Jordan	Nunes	Valadao
Joyce (OH)	Obenrolte	Van Drew
Joyce (PA)	Owens	Van Dyne
Katko	Palazzo	Wagner
Keller	Palmer	Walberg
Kelly (MS)	Pence	Walorski
Kelly (PA)	Perry	Waltz
Kim (CA)	Pfluger	Weber (TX)
Kustoff	Posey	Webster (FL)
LaHood	Reed	Wenstrup
LaMalfa	Reschenthaler	Westerman
Latta	Rice (SC)	Williams (TX)
LaTurner	Rodgers (WA)	Wilson (SC)
Lesko	Rogers (AL)	Womack
Letlow	Rogers (KY)	Young
Long	Rose	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—15

Buck	Hagedorn	Mast
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Schrader
Case	Lamborn	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Simpson
Guest	Lowenthal	Wittman

□ 1901

Messrs. GAETZ, CAWTHORN, REED, and Mrs. MILLER-MEEKS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to table was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Maloney,
(Moolenaar)	(Wagner)	Carolyn
Amodei	Grijalva	(Velázquez)
(Balderson)	(Stanton)	Meng (Jeffries)
Bucshon	Horsford	Napolitano
(Walorski)	(Jeffries)	(Correa)
Cuellar (Veasey)	Jones (Williams	Payne (Pallone)
DeSaulnier	(GA))	Porter (Wexton)
(Thompson	Kelly (PA)	Ruppersberger
(CA))	(Keller)	(Brown)
Deutch (Rice	Kirkpatrick	Rush
(Stanton)	(Stanton)	(Underwood)
Fulcher (Meuser)	Lawrence	Sires (Pallone)
(Beatty)	(Beatty)	Watson Coleman
Garcia (IL)	Lawson (FL)	(Pallone)
(Garcia (TX))	(Evans)	Wild (Axne)
Gonzalez (OH)	McEachin	Wilson (FL)
(Timmons)	(Wexton)	(Hayes)

AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1664) to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, as

amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 416, nays 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 220]

YEAS—416

Adams	Crenshaw	Hartzler
Aderholt	Crist	Hayes
Aguilar	Crow	Hern
Allen	Cuellar	Herrell
Allred	Curtis	Herrera Beutler
Amodei	Davids (KS)	Hice (GA)
Armstrong	Davidson	Higgins (NY)
Arrington	Davis, Danny K.	Hill
Auchincloss	Dean	Himes
Axne	DeFazio	Hinson
Babin	DeGette	Hollingsworth
Bacon	DeLauro	Horsford
Baird	DelBene	Houlahan
Balderson	Delgado	Hoyer
Banks	Demings	Hudson
Barr	DeSaulnier	Huffman
Barragán	DesJarlais	Huizenga
Bass	Deuth	Issa
Beatty	Diaz-Balart	Jackson
Bentz	Dingell	Jackson Lee
Bera	Doggett	Jacobs (CA)
Bergman	Donalds	Jacobs (NY)
Beyer	Doyle, Michael	Jayapal
Bice (OK)	F.	Jeffries
Biggs	Duncan	Johnson (GA)
Bilirakis	Dunn	Johnson (LA)
Bishop (GA)	Emmer	Johnson (OH)
Bishop (NC)	Escobar	Johnson (SD)
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Johnson (TX)
Blunt Rochester	Espallat	Jones
Boebert	Estes	Jordan
Bonamici	Evans	Joyce (OH)
Bost	Fallon	Joyce (PA)
Bourdeaux	Feenstra	Kahele
Bowman	Ferguson	Kaptur
Boyle, Brendan	Fischbach	Katko
F.	Fitzgerald	Keating
Brady	Fitzpatrick	Keller
Brooks	Fleischmann	Kelly (IL)
Brown	Fletcher	Kelly (MS)
Brownley	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Foster	Khanna
Bucshon	Fox	Kildee
Burchett	Frankel, Lois	Kilmer
Burgess	Franklin, C.	Kim (CA)
Bush	Scott	Kim (NJ)
Bustos	Fulcher	Kind
Butterfield	Gaetz	Kinzinger
Calvert	Gallagher	Kirkpatrick
Cammack	Galleo	Krishnamoorthi
Carbajal	Garamendi	Kuster
Cárdenas	Garbarino	Kustoff
Carl	Garcia (CA)	LaHood
Carson	Garcia (IL)	LaMalfa
Carter (GA)	Garcia (TX)	Lamb
Carter (LA)	Gibbs	Langevin
Carter (TX)	Gimenez	Larsen (WA)
Cartwright	Gohmert	Larson (CT)
Casten	Golden	Latta
Castor (FL)	Gomez	LaTurner
Castro (TX)	Gonzales, Tony	Lawrence
Cawthorn	Gonzalez (OH)	Lawson (FL)
Chabot	Gonzalez,	Lee (CA)
Chu	Vicente	Lee (NV)
Cicilline	Good (VA)	Leger Fernandez
Clark (MA)	Gooden (TX)	Lesko
Clarke (NY)	Gosar	Letlow
Cleaver	Gottheimer	Levin (CA)
Cline	Granger	Levin (MI)
Cloud	Graves (LA)	Lieu
Clyburn	Graves (MO)	Lofgren
Clyde	Green (TN)	Long
Cohen	Green, Al (TX)	Lowenthal
Cole	Greene (GA)	Lucas
Comer	Griffith	Luetkemeyer
Connolly	Grijalva	Luria
Cooper	Grothman	Lynch
Correa	Guest	Mace
Costa	Guthrie	Malinowski
Courtney	Harder (CA)	Malliotakis
Craig	Harris	Maloney,
Crawford	Harshbarger	Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean	Perry	Stauber
Mann	Peters	Steel
Manning	Pfluger	Stefanik
Massie	Phillips	Steil
Matsui	Pingree	Steube
McBath	Pocan	Stevens
McCarthy	Porter	Stewart
McCaul	Posey	Strickland
McClain	Pressley	Suozzi
McClintock	Price (NC)	Swalwell
McCollum	Quigley	Takano
McEachin	Raskin	Taylor
McGovern	Reed	Tenney
McHenry	Reschenthaler	Thompson (CA)
McKinley	Rice (NY)	Thompson (MS)
McNerney	Rice (SC)	Thompson (PA)
Meeks	Rodgers (WA)	Tiffany
Meijer	Rogers (AL)	Timmons
Meng	Rogers (KY)	Titus
Meuser	Rose	Tlaib
Mfume	Rosendale	Tonko
Miller (IL)	Ross	Torres (CA)
Miller (WV)	Rouzer	Torres (NY)
Miller-Meeks	Roy	Trahan
Moolenaar	Roybal-Allard	Trone
Mooney	Ruiz	Turner
Moore (AL)	Ruppersberger	Underwood
Moore (UT)	Rush	Upton
Moore (WI)	Rutherford	Valadao
Morelle	Ryan	Van Drew
Moulton	Salazar	Van Dуйne
Mrvan	Sánchez	Vargas
Mullin	Sarbanes	Veasey
Murphy (FL)	Scalise	Vela
Murphy (NC)	Scanlon	Velázquez
Nadler	Schakowsky	Wagner
Napolitano	Schiff	Walberg
Neal	Schneider	Walorski
Neguse	Schrier	Walt
Nehls	Schweikert	Wasserman
Newhouse	Scott (VA)	Schultz
Newman	Scott, David	Waters
Norcross	Sessions	Watson Coleman
Norman	Sewell	Weber (TX)
Nunes	Sherman	Webster (FL)
O'Halleran	Sherrill	Welch
Obenrolte	Sires	Wenstrup
Ocasio-Cortez	Slotkin	Westerman
Omar	Smith (MO)	Wexton
Owens	Smith (NE)	Wild
Palazzo	Smith (NJ)	Williams (GA)
Pallone	Smith (WA)	Williams (TX)
Palmer	Smucker	Wilson (FL)
Panetta	Soto	Wilson (SC)
Pappas	Spanberger	Womack
Pascrell	Spartz	Yarmuth
Payne	Speier	Young
Pence	Stansbury	Zeldin
Perlmutter	Stanton	

NOT VOTING—14

□ 1922

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt	Grijalva	Maloney,
(Moolenaar)	(Stanton)	Carolyn
Amodei	Horsford	(Velázquez)
(Balderson)	(Jeffries)	Meng (Jeffries)
Bucshon	Jones (Williams)	Napolitano
(Walorski)	(GA)	(Correa)
Cuellar (Veasey)	Kelly (PA)	Payne (Pallone)
DeSaulnier	(Keller)	Porter (Wexton)
(Thompson)	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
(CA)	(Stanton)	(Brown)
Deuth (Rice)	Lawrence	Rush
(NY)	(Beatty)	(Underwood)
Fulcher (Meuser)	Lawson (FL)	Sires (Pallone)
Garcia (IL)	(Evans)	Watson Coleman
(Garcia (TX))	Lowenthal	(Pallone)
Gonzalez (OH)	(Beyer)	Wild (Axne)
(Timmons)	McEachin	Wilson (FL)
Graves (MO)	(Wagener)	(Hayes)

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER. The Chair asks all Members in the Chamber, as well as Members and staff throughout the Capitol, to observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson of the United States Capitol Police who were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol on July 24, 1998.

GOLD STAR MOTHERS FAMILY MONUMENT EXTENSION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PIN-GREE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2365) to extend the authority for the establishment of a commemorative work in honor of Gold Star Families, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. Dingell) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 221]

YEAS—412

Adams	Cammack	DesJarlais
Aderholt	Carbajal	Deuth
Aguilar	Cárdenas	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Carl	Dingell
Allred	Carson	Doggett
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Donalds
Armstrong	Carter (LA)	Doyle, Michael
Arrington	Carter (TX)	F.
Auchincloss	Cartwright	Duncan
Axne	Casten	Dunn
Babin	Castor (FL)	Emmer
Bacon	Castro (TX)	Escobar
Baird	Cawthorn	Eshoo
Balderson	Chabot	Espallat
Banks	Chu	Estes
Barr	Cicilline	Evans
Barragán	Clark (MA)	Fallon
Bass	Clarke (NY)	Feenstra
Beatty	Cleaver	Ferguson
Bentz	Cline	Fischbach
Bera	Cloud	Fitzgerald
Bergman	Clyburn	Fitzpatrick
Beyer	Clyde	Fleischmann
Bice (OK)	Cohen	Fletcher
Biggs	Cole	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Comer	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Fox
Bishop (NC)	Cooper	Frankel, Lois
Blumenauer	Correa	Franklin, C.
Blunt Rochester	Costa	Scott
Boebert	Courtney	Fulcher
Bonamici	Craig	Gaetz
Bost	Crawford	Gallagher
Bourdeaux	Crenshaw	Galleo
Bowman	Crist	Garamendi
Boyle, Brendan	Crow	Garbarino
F.	Cuellar	Garcia (CA)
Brady	Curtis	Garcia (IL)
Brooks	Davids (KS)	Garcia (TX)
Brown	Davidson	Gibbs
Brownley	Davis, Danny K.	Gimenez
Buchanan	Dean	Gohmert
Bucshon	DeFazio	Golden
Burchett	DeGette	Gomez
Burgess	DeLauro	Gonzales, Tony
Bush	DelBene	Gonzalez (OH)
Bustos	Delgado	Gonzalez,
Butterfield	Demings	Vicente
Calvert	DeSaulnier	Good (VA)

Gooden (TX)	Luetkemeyer	Rush
Gosar	Luria	Rutherford
Gottheimer	Lynch	Ryan
Granger	Mace	Salazar
Graves (LA)	Malinowski	Sánchez
Graves (MO)	Malliotakis	Sarbanes
Green (TN)	Maloney	Scalise
Green, Al (TX)	Carolyn B.	Scanlon
Greene (GA)	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Griffith	Mann	Schiff
Grijalva	Manning	Schneider
Grothman	Massie	Schrier
Guest	Matsui	Schweikert
Guthrie	McBath	Scott (VA)
Harder (CA)	McCarthy	Scott, David
Harris	McCaull	Sessions
Harshbarger	McClain	Sewell
Hartzler	McClintock	Sherman
Hayes	McCollum	Sherrill
Hern	McEachin	Sires
Herrell	McGovern	Slotkin
Herrera Beutler	McHenry	Smith (MO)
Hice (GA)	McKinley	Smith (NE)
Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Smith (NJ)
Hill	Meijer	Smith (WA)
Himes	Meng	Smucker
Hinson	Meuser	Soto
Hollingsworth	Mfume	Spanberger
Horsford	Miller (IL)	Spartz
Houlahan	Miller (WV)	Speier
Hoyer	Miller-Meeks	Stansbury
Hudson	Moolenaar	Stanton
Huffman	Mooney	Stauber
Huizenga	Moore (AL)	Steel
Issa	Moore (UT)	Stefanik
Jackson	Moore (WI)	Steil
Jackson Lee	Morelle	Steube
Jacobs (CA)	Moulton	Stevens
Jacobs (NY)	Mrvan	Stewart
Jayapal	Murphy (FL)	Strickland
Jeffries	Murphy (NC)	Suozi
Johnson (GA)	Nadler	Swalwell
Johnson (LA)	Napolitano	Takano
Johnson (OH)	Neal	Taylor
Johnson (SD)	Neguse	Tenney
Johnson (TX)	Nehls	Thompson (CA)
Jones	Newhouse	Thompson (MS)
Jordan	Newman	Thompson (PA)
Joyce (OH)	Norcross	Tiffany
Joyce (PA)	Norman	Timmons
Kahele	Nunes	Titus
Kaptur	O'Halleran	Tlaib
Katko	Obernolte	Tonko
Keating	Ocasio-Cortez	Torres (CA)
Keller	Omar	Torres (NY)
Kelly (IL)	Owens	Trahan
Kelly (MS)	Palazzo	Trone
Kelly (PA)	Pallone	Turner
Khanna	Palmer	Underwood
Kildee	Panetta	Upton
Kilmer	Pappas	Valadao
Kim (CA)	Pascrell	Van Drew
Kim (NJ)	Payne	Van Duyn
Kind	Pence	Vargas
Kinzinger	Perlmutter	Veasey
Kirkpatrick	Perry	Velázquez
Krishnamoorthi	Peters	Wagner
Kuster	Pfluger	Walberg
Kustoff	Phillips	Walorski
LaHood	Phingree	Waltz
LaMalfa	Pocan	Wasserman
Lamb	Porter	Schultz
Langevin	Posey	Waters
Larsen (WA)	Pressley	Watson Coleman
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Weber (TX)
Latta	Quigley	Webster (FL)
LaTurner	Raskin	Welch
Lawrence	Reed	Wenstrup
Lawson (FL)	Reschenthaler	Westerman
Lee (CA)	Rice (NY)	Wexton
Lee (NV)	Rice (SC)	Wild
Leger Fernandez	Rodgers (WA)	Williams (GA)
Lesko	Rogers (AL)	Williams (TX)
Letlow	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (FL)
Levin (CA)	Rose	Wilson (SC)
Levin (MI)	Rosendale	Womack
Lieu	Ross	Yarmuth
Lofgren	Roy	Young
Long	Roybal-Allard	Zeldin
Lowenthal	Ruiz	
Lucas	Ruppersberger	

NOT VOTING—18

Buck	Higgins (LA)	Rouzer
Budd	Lamborn	Schrader
Case	Loudermilk	Scott, Austin
Cheney	Mast	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	Meeks	Vela
Hagedorn	Mullin	Wittman

□ 1944

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Aderholt	Grijalva	Maloney
(Moolenaar)	(Stanton)	Carolyn
Amodei	Horsford	(Velázquez)
(Balderson)	(Jeffries)	Meng (Jeffries)
Bucshon	Jones (Williams)	Napolitano
(Walorski)	(GA)	(Correa)
Cuellar (Veasey)	Kelly (PA)	Payne (Pallone)
DeSaulnier	(Keller)	Porter (Wexton)
(Thompson)	Kirkpatrick	Ruppersberger
(CA)	(Stanton)	(Brown)
Deutch (Rice)	Lawrence	Rush
(NY)	(Beatty)	(Underwood)
Fulcher (Meuser)	Lawson (FL)	Sires (Pallone)
Garcia (IL)	(Evans)	Watson Coleman
(Garcia (TX))	(Lowenthal)	(Pallone)
Gonzalez (OH)	(Beyer)	Wild (Axne)
(Timmons)	McEachin	Wilson (FL)
Graves (MO)	(Wexton)	(Hayes)
(Wagner)		

PERMISSION FOR MEMBER TO BE
CONSIDERED AS PRIMARY SPON-
SOR OF H.R. 1744

Mr. PAPPAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may hereafter be considered to be the primary sponsor of H.R. 1744, a bill originally introduced by Representative HASTINGS of Florida, for the purpose of adding co-sponsors and requesting reprintings pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BOURDEAUX). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

CELEBRATING 31ST ANNIVERSARY
OF ADA

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Madam Speaker, this morning, I had the privilege of joining President Biden at the White House to celebrate the 31st anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

This landmark civil rights law has drastically improved the lives of people with disabilities across our Nation, including mine.

In 1980, an accidental gunshot left me paralyzed, and for 10 years, I experienced firsthand the adversity that the disability community faced before the ADA.

Since its enactment, this law has helped break down barriers and stamp out discrimination. It has opened doors to new opportunities for people with disabilities and allowed members of our community to reach previously unattainable places in society.

In fact, I can say with confidence that without the ADA, I would not be a Member of Congress proudly representing the people of Rhode Island.

Madam Speaker, though we have made tremendous progress with the

ADA, we can't stop fighting yet. I will continue working closely with advocates and lawmakers like my dear friend, our Majority Leader, STENY HOYER, to advance meaningful legislation to support and protect the rights of people with disabilities.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BRIAN
SCHLIFKE

(Mr. BARR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a great American and my dear friend, Brian Schlifke, of Lexington, Kentucky.

Brian served in the United States Army Signal Corps during the Vietnam war, answering our Nation's call with valor through two tours. He was a specialist in communications and earned the Bronze Star and Combat Medal. He once said that he was "no hero, just proud to have been of service to my fellow soldiers."

He continued that spirit of service throughout his life, working diligently on behalf of other veterans. He was associated with the Vietnam Veterans of America and Kentucky's Sixth District Veterans Coalition.

Brian was a tireless advocate for his fellow veterans and worked in a positive way to bring about necessary legislative changes. He had a great spirit and a contagious smile, and his love for his country was unwavering.

Our Nation lost a true patriot when Brian passed away on June 20, 2021. Brian is survived by his wife, Anne, and many other family members.

It is my distinct honor, on behalf of a grateful Nation, to remember, recognize, and pay tribute to the exemplary life of Brian Schlifke.

REMEMBERING DAVID CASTRO

(Mrs. FLETCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. FLETCHER. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor the life of one of my constituents, David Castro.

Born and raised in Houston over the last 17 years, David was tragically killed in a road rage incident on his way home from an Astros game just earlier this month.

He had a bright future ahead of him. A National Merit Scholar semifinalist, he excelled in math and physics. He was a percussionist in the Westside High School marching band.

Today, as I extend my deep condolences to David's family and friends for their loss, I rise to share their wish that our community and our country remember David through random acts of kindness. What a beautiful way to memorialize him.

David Castro will be missed but never forgotten and will live on in acts of kindness across this country.

HONORING THE LIFE OF COLONEL EDWARD IRWIN WEXLER

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor the life of Colonel Edward Wexler, of Savannah, Georgia, who passed away on June 30 at the age of 75.

Colonel Wexler was a Savannah native who lived a truly remarkable life. After graduating from The Citadel, he was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the United States Air Force. Colonel Wexler traveled the world with the United States Air Force, serving in many different countries. He retired from the Air National Guard in 2006, having over 35 years of service.

Following retirement, Colonel Wexler continued to serve his community. He became director of the Combined Federal Campaign for Coastal Georgia, president of the Savannah Military Officers Association, and junior vice commander of the Veterans Council of Chatham County.

Colonel Wexler's dedication to improving the lives of others will never be forgotten. My thoughts and prayers are with Colonel Wexler's family, friends, and all who knew him during this most difficult time.

RESTORING COMMUNITIES LEFT BEHIND

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to thank Chairwoman MAXINE WATERS for including the Restoring Communities Left Behind Act in her Housing is Infrastructure bill.

This legislation, led by Congresswoman RASHIDA TLAIB and myself, would direct \$5 billion toward programs for homeowner rehabilitation assistance, weatherization, improved accessibility for seniors and people with disabilities, refinancing, and property tax relief.

It will restore quality housing in the cities I represent, such as Toledo, Lorain, Sandusky, and Cleveland, which have suffered from decades of job losses, recessions, the foreclosure crisis of 2008, and chronic housing underinvestment.

Congress must serve as a partner to our on-the-ground organizations and local leaders who know what resources are needed where and how best to deploy them to revive their neighborhoods.

These investments will repair homes, stimulate economic growth, and revitalize communities. I urge all of my colleagues to support its passage, and I send my thanks to all who have helped us along this really vital road.

RETURN OF DEBT CEILING

(Mr. BURCHETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURCHETT. Madam Speaker, the return of the debt ceiling on July 31 should flash fiscal warning signs for every elected official in Congress.

The debt ceiling was suspended for 2 years back in 2019. Since then, Congress has kept up its reckless spending habits like a teenage shopaholic at the mall with a credit card.

Now, government debt is over 100 percent of our domestic product—100 percent, Madam Speaker.

We clearly ignored the spending problems that got us into this mess in the first place. There needs to be a limit on how much debt elected officials can put on the taxpayers' shoulders.

My legislation, the Reforming America's Fiscal Toolkit Act, would amend Congress' budget process to keep government debt lower than our gross domestic product. This would limit how much financial trouble Congress can get the country into.

You know what they say, Madam Speaker: The first step to solving a problem is recognizing you have a problem, and dadgummit, Congress has a problem.

Congress needs to put a spending check on itself, or our country is going to end up like that out-of-control teenage shopaholic: bad credit, high interest rates, broke, and living in their parents' basement.

200 DAYS OF DELIVERING FOR THE PEOPLE

(Mr. AUCHINCLOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Madam Speaker, last week, we celebrated the 200th day of the 117th Congress and 200 days of getting shots in arms, students in classrooms, money in pockets, and Americans back to work.

Thanks to House Democrats and President Biden, we passed the American Rescue Plan, delivering funding and relief to the Commonwealth and to Americans across the country.

In Massachusetts, nearly 74 percent of adults are fully vaccinated, allowing them to reunite with friends and loved ones, and we have sent over 500,000 stimulus checks to Bay Staters.

When I came to Congress, I promised our students and families that they would return to in-person learning. The American Rescue Plan delivered on my pledge, providing Massachusetts schools with \$1.8 billion in Federal relief to support their students and staff as they re-entered the classroom.

We lifted up our care economy, securing over \$1 billion to reduce the cost of childcare and pay our care workers a fair wage.

As a parent, I worked hard to provide our working families with the historic

tax relief that they deserve. The child tax credit we passed will cut child poverty in half and help nearly 60 percent of children in my district, from Brookline to Fall River.

We passed the INVEST Act, a transformational bill that will reimagine transportation while delivering clean energy and spurring job creation. Now, the Senate has the legislative framework it needs to make our infrastructure plan a reality.

From the depths of the crisis, House Democrats delivered needed recovery for Americans in just 200 days.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABOR- TION ACT

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, in Pasco County, one of the counties in my district, we have seen a huge spike in overdoses, including 25 fatalities in the month of June alone. Very, very sad.

During January through June 2021, we have seen more overdoses than any other similar period on record.

Fentanyl continues to be a significant factor. We must do everything we can to prevent fentanyl from flooding our streets, including stopping the free flow at our Nation's southern border.

I have been to the border, Madam Speaker, and I have seen how easy it is to move drugs into our country. We must secure our border.

Additionally, we must implement commonsense safeguards to prevent opioid abuse and improve access to quality treatment options. I will continue to work on these priorities.

Separately, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

□ 2000

RECOGNIZING THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DIS- ABILITIES ACT

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

As someone who spent their career before Congress as a healthcare rehabilitation professional, I experienced

firsthand how with the right tools and accessibility, disabled Americans can live a life of independence, economic self-sufficiency, and pride.

The Americans with Disabilities Act is a monumental piece of legislation, opening the doors of opportunity to the millions of Americans who have a disability, whether it be physical, learning, cognitive, or any other.

Whether it is protection from discrimination in the workplace, additional support in school, or added accommodations in our public venues, the ADA provides the support to better empower those individuals living with disabilities.

Madam Speaker, while we saw this landmark legislation signed into law 31 years ago today, we must continue to advocate for the rights of Americans who are living with disabilities. The ADA is an incredible milestone for Americans living with disabilities, but there is still more work to be done. We can all continue to do more for those living with disabilities, from defying prejudice to empowering those with disabilities in everyday lives.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mr. BABIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hyde amendment. For more than 40 years, Hyde enjoyed strong bipartisan support, with both Republicans and Democrats agreeing that Americans should never be forced to fund abortions with their hard-earned tax dollars.

However, President Biden and my Democrat colleagues have now decided to abolish this crucial protection. By eliminating the Hyde amendment from their budget, they have disregarded the conscience rights of all Americans and blatantly attacked the lives of the unborn.

As the father of five children and the grandfather of 17, I know just how precious life is, and I will never stop fighting to protect the Hyde amendment.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

CRISIS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER

(Mr. GROTHMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Speaker, two weeks ago, I spent additional time

at the U.S. border, which I think, by a mile, is the biggest crisis this country has.

It has recently been brought to my attention that the Rio Grande Valley sector, where I was at, recently had 20,000 people a week processed. They had never seen such a thing.

What difference does this make? The more people come across, first of all, it probably means more illegal drugs crossing the border, which means more fentanyl, which is the reason why we have 90,000 deaths a year in this country. Since they're processing more people, it means less Border Patrol agents to guard the more rural areas of the border, which means more people coming across.

Finally, we are in a situation, we found out, down there, when they turn people over with COVID to the non-governmental entities, those entities do not have secure facilities, and it means people are flowing into this country who we already know have COVID.

Please, during this appropriations season, please add more money to our Border Patrol so we can get a handle on these ridiculously high numbers.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida. Madam Speaker, for more than 40 years, the Hyde amendment has prevented taxpayers from funding abortions through government programs. Historically, it has been included in annual spending bills by both parties. But recently, Democrats voted to eliminate Hyde amendment protections. Even President Biden previously said: "Those of us who are opposed to abortion should not be compelled to pay for them," but it would appear he and his Democrat colleagues have abandoned this critical position.

With nearly 60 percent of Americans agreeing that taxpayer dollars should not be used to fund abortion, we must stand for life. Accordingly, I support H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mr. WESTERMAN asked and was given permission to address the House

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion and Abortion Insurance Full Disclosure Act of 2021.

Earlier this month, President Biden released his budget, which does not include the Hyde amendment, an amendment that prohibits Federal taxpayer dollars from funding abortions through Medicaid. Hyde has been included in every appropriations package since 1976 and is a longstanding, bipartisan common ground bill between Republicans and Democrats to protect the conscience of taxpayers.

President Biden has consistently expressed support for the Hyde amendment throughout his career, and I am disappointed that his recent shift signals to the American people that he will cave to the political pressures of his left wing and force our tax dollars to pay for the eugenics of our Nation's poorest individuals who are on Medicaid. We cannot stand for this and must codify Hyde's restrictions on taxpayer-funded abortions.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mr. MANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MANN. Madam Speaker, I stand today to voice my support for H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, which would protect the American people from a gross misuse of taxpayer dollars.

I cosponsored H.R. 18 during my first few days in Congress, because I, along with the majority of American voters, believe that no person should be required to pay for abortions or abortion services. President Biden himself pledged never to force taxpayers to pay for abortions, and yet he has broken that promise by failing to include the Hyde amendment in his new budget proposal.

Devaluing the life of unborn children has desensitized America. We should never use taxpayer dollars to fund abortion services. Instead, we should focus on lifesaving resources that focus on both the mother and the child.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, and I

ask for its immediate consideration in this House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 18, NO TAXPAYER FUNDING FOR ABORTION ACT

(Mr. HUDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, as a father, I believe that every life has value, and I am proud to be pro-life.

But whether you are pro-life or not, my fellow North Carolinians and Americans all across the country agree that government should not use taxpayer dollars to fund abortions.

That is why the Hyde amendment was created.

The Hyde amendment has saved 2.5 million lives and protected the conscience rights of Americans, all with overwhelmingly bipartisan support.

In fact, Hyde has been renewed every year since 1976, under majorities and Presidents of both parties, including President Barack Obama.

However, in his most recent budget proposal, President Joe Biden chose to ignore precedent and the will of the people by excluding Hyde amendment protections.

This is a radical shift in policy.

Americans should not be forced to violate their conscience to pay for abortions.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, and the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 18, the No Taxpayer Funding for Abortion Act, and I ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair previously advised, that request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

THE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER IS UNPROTECTED

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, we have a record-setting surge of illegal drugs coming in across our southern border, including the very, very deadly fentanyl, which takes only small amounts to greatly affect many people, as well as whatever other activities the cartels want to do.

The U.S.-Mexico border is basically unprotected, and it doesn't seem to be a priority of the Biden administration at all. Please, prove me wrong.

Yet, the Biden administration is happy to, once again, push the idea of perhaps shutting down the country over COVID again. Is it because of the

delta variant, or now is it going to be over a new Mexico variant? But it seems to be coming our way.

Yet, they will not control the border and the flow of illegal immigrants that might be carrying COVID themselves, whether it is through the new Mexico variant or not.

So you have to ask, whose side is this administration on with this open sieve of a border, these drugs coming through, illegal immigrants coming through, and then putting the clamps down on our own economy and our own people?

FIGHTING FOR THE RIGHT TO VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I am here to anchor this Special Order on the fierce urgency of preserving the precious right to vote by passing H.R. 4, the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, and legislation like H.R. 1, For The People.

I am delighted to be co-anchoring this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order at the request of our tireless leader for justice, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY of Ohio, and to be joined by my co-anchor, Congressman RITCHIE TORRES of New York, and many other members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Fifty-six years ago, in a century that was close to a hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation and the rendition of the 15th Amendment, the very right to vote, there we were fighting with this beloved Member of Congress, who challenged us to get into good trouble, fighting in 1965, pursuant to the collapse of the understanding of the 15th Amendment, fighting for the right to vote again.

Madam Speaker, here we are today, 2021, now 56 years after the 1965 Voting Rights Act, fighting for the right to vote.

I want to make sure that I pay tribute to Our Power, Our Message, led by the Honorable JOYCE BEATTY, who does not only speak her words, but she acts on her words, how proud we were. But I am sure pride is not what she wants us to feel as she walked down this difficult road here in Washington, D.C., to be able to express, with Black women and others, that we have a fierce sense of urgency, and was arrested, just about two weeks ago, in the name of voting rights.

So let me, for a moment, read to you out of the book that has just been published by a dear, beloved friend, "Carry On." I use this book in the Rules Committee, when there seems to have been a challenge to helping the impoverished. I concluded my remarks, when I was giving amendments, to help the impoverished to carry on.

But on the issue of justice, these are his words: "We must practice what we preach. If we believe in life and liberty, then we should not defer the dream of equality and justice"—the right to vote—"under the law for people of color. We must use the system of government to improve our laws and to make our society fairer and more just. While no one bill can right the many wrongs, we can stitch together partial solutions to deal with the complex societal issues that lead to systemic bias and inequality."

That is why we stand here today. We are stitching together a response to the collapse of voting rights in America. We are stitching together laws that will deal with the mass of suppression laws being passed in State legislatures across America. We are stitching together a response for those brave Texas Democratic representatives who are here in Washington, D.C., who are begging us to pass H.R. 1 and S. 1 and of course we have passed H.R. 1 and the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

□ 2015

Let me just briefly say that serious damage to the precious right to vote occasioned by the rightwing conservative majority on the Supreme Court demands that the Congress exercise its powers under section 5 of the 15th Amendment to restore the extraordinary reach and effectiveness of section 2 and section 5 of the Voting Rights Act. The 15th Amendment said that no law, no State legislature should abridge the right to vote on the basis of discrimination of race and color and ethnicity and that the Congress should stand up and provide the relief and the answer.

Did you hear, Madam Speaker? The Congress. And the Congressional Black Caucus has said that, not only with their words but with their bodies. HANK JOHNSON was just arrested last week, Congressman HANK JOHNSON.

So the objection to the VRA and their opponents is without substance. I have long said that the States that were subject to preclearance under the Voting Rights Act earned their way into so doing by discriminatory laws.

Madam Speaker, June 25, 2021, marked the eighth anniversary of the Supreme Court's infamous decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, which immobilized the Department of Justice from subjecting discriminatory voting and election laws to the preclearance.

On August 6 will be the commemoration of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. 56 years. And look at the predicament we are in.

Later on in this debate I will recount all the times we voted for the Voting Rights Act. Madam Speaker, it was bipartisan. It was across racial lines, regional lines, because we knew it was the right thing to do.

So tonight we stand on what is right. We stand on good trouble. We stand on making the decision that not the

Shelby case, not the Arizona case. The Arizona case is *Brnovich v. DNC* that dashes section 2, and frankly says, by one of the justices, that a little bit of discrimination is okay. Not on the watch of the Congressional Black Caucus and all of my colleagues, because voting rights belongs to every single person in this Congress and to their constituents.

Why would they want to deny the implementation and the substance of the Constitution and the 15th Amendment?

So here we are tonight to be able to explain to the American public and our colleagues that we cannot wait any longer for H.R. 4 or H.R. 1, S. 1, S. 4, and we are here tonight to tell our story.

It is my pleasure and certainly my privilege, as we continue to tell our story, and as I continue to weave in that story, to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. BEATTY), who, again, has spoken with her actions, not just her words, the Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, senior member and chairwoman on the Financial Services Committee, and, again, someone who showed the Nation that it is both our message and our power by being arrested in the name of the fight for equality, getting into a little good trouble.

I am sure John Lewis, rest in power, is looking down on us.

Mrs. BEATTY. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who is coanchor with Congressman RITCHIE TORRES.

Let me say this: Congresswoman JACKSON LEE is at the right place in the right time in history. I thank her for her leadership and her powerful, profound words of talking about not only our late Congressman John Lewis, but talking about why we are here tonight, speaking truth to power, from her own experiences, from her own leadership, from those marches that I have read about and witnessed her in, leading not only individuals from Texas but across this Nation. So I thank her and look forward to hearing her talk about voting rights under attack.

Lastly, let me thank her for quoting from his latest book, "Carry On." Just as it was fitting for her, as a powerful attorney, to talk about justice, in that book he talks about voting rights, and in that book he kept it quite simple. In capital letters, he said: Vote, vote, vote. And stand up for the right of voting, because voting rights belong to all of us and all of our constituents.

Madam Speaker, let me say tonight, I rise and join my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus for this Special Order hour on a critically important topic, voting rights.

The Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour is generally regarded as a solemn moment to give the CBC an opportunity to speak directly to the American people and to reflect on the ideas and policies of critical interest to our constituents.

Well, tonight I speak to the people about the right to vote. We are gathered in this sacred Chamber, the floor of the people's House, to discuss the future of voting rights in America, to amplify our power, our message, and to boldly proclaim that we are not going to let the clock be turned back to a time when the votes of Black people were restricted and limited by those who feared our power.

On behalf of the 57 members of the Congressional Black Caucus, I come today to share some thoughts and join my colleagues on this debate on voting rights.

The right to vote is under attack, and some of those attacks have taken place right here in this Chamber, and in other States across the Nation.

So, Madam Speaker, let me be clear to the American people: The Congressional Black Caucus will not sit idly by as State legislatures, fueled by the support of adversaries intent on limiting our access to the ballot box, voter suppression, changing the rules of engagement after we have been victorious. We have the majority in the House, the Senate, and we are building back better with the Biden-Harris administration. To all of those who believe it does not exist, I have a message for you: We won. We stand for the people, because we were elected by the people.

The civil disobedience displayed by the proud Black women and activists, allies, and others just over a week and a half ago that our coanchor talked about, we were there for a reason, organized by good friend and colleague Melanie Campbell, Clayola Brown, Barbara Skinner, the Reverend Barbara Skinner, and so many other women. Well, yes, I was proud to stand with them.

On that day I did reflect back on how many of my CBC colleagues had been arrested and what they fought for that gave me the privilege to stand on this floor tonight. Did I think about John Lewis and did I think about Fannie Lou Hamer and so many more? Yes. Did I think about Rosa Parks and what she did to give us the Montgomery March of 1955 when she sat down that gave us 1964 civil rights, 1965 voting rights, 1968 jobs and housing act, and so much more?

Well, tonight, that is what we are standing here for. We understand, Madam Speaker, that you can't change the future if you don't acknowledge the past. And that is why you will hear us repeatedly talk about the legal cases. You will hear us talking about our rich history. And as much as we embrace it and we love it, we are not going back to it. And that is why we are standing here.

Madam Speaker, I stand with Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE and coanchor RITCHIE TORRES. Let me just say tonight, we send a strong message that we are here to pass H.R. 1 and H.R. 4, the For the People Act and the John Lewis Voting Rights Act. We are done waiting. We are done being patient.

If it means we have to speak out, if it means we have to stand up and march and protest, then that is what we will do. The example set by Democrats across the United States, and specifically those members who came here from Texas, we stand with them, because they were forced to come here. Are they making a bold statement? Yes.

But think about it. It has only taken one action, one person to get the attention of the Nation to change things and make it right. And that is what we are doing. When people ask why, why do we stand here and stand up for freedom and justice and our equal rights and to protect our voting rights? Because we know if we don't stand up for ourselves, what will our future be like? What will the future of our children, our grandchildren, and those yet unborn be like? Well, we want to stand up today for H.R. 1, for H.R. 4, so we leave them with a better future.

Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE for giving me the opportunity to speak tonight.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus for her powerful words. And, yes, thank her for acknowledging the women who stood in the gap, including Melanie Campbell and Reverend Barbara Williams Skinner and Clayola Brown, and Tamika, who has been at the forefront as well, and many, many others that have, likewise, been at the forefront. We are pleased to be able to join in their leadership as well.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES), a gentleman who now walks in history, who knows his history, and who is prepared to fight against that history that should never be repeated, my coanchor, who has eloquently articulated what was in General Granger's Order No. 3, and that is the equality of rights.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, it is always a pleasure to be here with Congresswoman JACKSON LEE.

The culprit is not only the Republican Party, but it is also the Supreme Court. The rightwing majority on the Supreme Court gave the Voting Rights Act the narrowest possible meaning in order to render it powerless against 21st century voter suppression.

Congress deliberately wrote the Voting Rights Act broadly so as to protect against both obvious and insidious forms of voter disenfranchisement. The broad language of the Voting Rights

Act prohibits not only the denial, but also the abridgement of voting rights. It prohibits not only discriminatory intent, but also racially disparate impact. It requires that all methods of voting be equally open to communities of color, and that communities of color have an equal opportunity to cast their ballots.

And so anything that undermines equal openness and equal opportunity is a violation of the Voting Rights Act properly interpreted. I would submit to you that voter suppression in America has no greater ally than rightwing judicial activism.

□ 2030

Instead of interpreting the Voting Rights Act as written, the rightwing majority on the Supreme Court has chosen to rewrite the statute out of existence. The enforcement mechanisms of the Voting Rights Act have been all but eviscerated. There was section 5, which provided for preclearance, which enabled the executive branch to protect voting rights. Then there was section 2, which provided for litigation, which enabled the courts to protect voting rights.

Both of those enforcement mechanisms had been gutted at the hands of the Supreme Court, the former in *Shelby County v. Holder* and the latter in *Brnovich v. DNC*.

We know from history, Madam Speaker, that the most effective tool for preventing voter suppression is preclearance. According to Justice Kagan, from 1965 to 2006, the Federal Government harnessed the power of section 5, the power of preclearance, to prevent 1,200 voting restrictions from taking effect.

We should see the desecration of both section 5 and section 2 as a call to action, as a call for the United States Congress to pass the John Lewis Voting Rights Act, which would restore our preclearance not only for select jurisdictions but for every State and locality across the Nation.

Let it be known that the greatest obstacle on the path to 21st century voting rights enforcement is the filibuster. The filibuster perpetuates a status quo that disenfranchises communities of color. If you are a defender of the filibuster, then you should dispense with the pretense that you are a champion of voting rights. If you are a defender of the filibuster, you are not part of the solution, but you are part of the problem.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for opening the pathway. We may have him continue to explore that journey, which I will take up, and that is the question of the filibuster. Someone described it as busting things up and busting good things up.

We know that there has to be a solution to those who have argued that, in fact, they are about the institution of the other body; they are about the integrity of the other body. I would

argue that where blood has been shed so that people have died so that people might vote, it is not the integrity of the institution. It is the life and death of voting rights, not only for people of color, but for this Nation.

A man who has argued eloquently about the filibuster and a resolve of our next steps, but also recognizes historically, not only the civil rights journey but the fundamental right of voting that should not be hindered or undermined is our majority whip, and we are very grateful for his leadership and his historical perspective and his current understanding of how we have to get the job done.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN).

Mr. CLYBURN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me and thank her so much for bringing this issue before the American people.

For several weeks now, we have all heard discussions about various aspects of H.R. 1 and H.R. 4. Now, H.R. 4, as all of us know, has not yet passed the Congress and is now before the Senate.

But I wanted to bring two issues to the forefront here this evening. The first one has to do with the so-called preclearance that we just heard a discussion on. I am serving in the Congress today in large part because of the preclearance in the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

But preclearance came into being because of some targeted legislation, legislation targeted toward those States that had a history of discriminating. Therefore, because all the States did not have that kind of a history, we had to go out and develop a record to show that this is the reason these particular States are being targeted. All or parts of seven States were initially covered and, of course, we all know what happened in *Shelby County v. Holder*.

The 1965 Voting Rights Act was virtually gutted because the formula of section 4 is no longer operative. Therefore, section 5 has really been neutralized, which is the preclearance.

Here is something I want to bring to the attention of the American people, and that is this: If you were to only pass preclearance as it relates to a history of discrimination, we will miss what is happening in the country today. Pennsylvania was not one of those States. Yet, we see massive discrimination in voting being advocated throughout Pennsylvania. The same thing is going on up in Michigan.

Now, according to the studies I have read, 48 States have now put into place or proposed—I think 28 of them have put into place—restrictive voting laws. Under the standard of the 1965 Voting Rights Act, these States would not be covered. Therefore, it is time for everybody to turn their attention to what we need to do about preclearance.

I submit that preclearance needs to be applied universally to all 50 States, because if you pass preclearance, zeroing in on seven, eight, nine States, and

then another State pops up with a new restrictive law, that State would not be covered under preclearance, and I think it is time for us to take a look at that as well.

Madam Speaker, I call upon my friends in the Senate to not wait around for us to develop this record, though I think it is pretty much in place, look at applying preclearance to all 50 States.

The second thing I think that we are needing to begin to think about that is not being discussed is this little thing called nullification; states enacting nullification laws. If you look at the Georgia law that they passed, it is very suppressive. It restricts. The thing that is insulting to me is that little part in there that allows an established commission to overturn the results of an election, to nullify the results of an election. None of us are using that word today, but that word is very prominent when you look at what States are doing.

That violates not just laws as passed by this Congress, that violates the Constitution. The Constitution is very clear. Article I, Section 4 tells us that no State can pass final judgment on federal elections. No State. The best argument for that is sitting right there in *The Federalist Papers* No. 59. It talks about it and lays out examples as to why the Federal Government cannot allow States to determine the election.

That is why the Supreme Court made it very clear that States could not put term limits on Members of Congress because that is not their purview. When you see nullification laws coming forward, I think it is incumbent upon this Congress to step in and do what is necessary to exert the Constitution of the United States. That is what is at threat here today. That is why I have argued irrespective of what you may feel about filibusters.

Filibusters ought not be applied to anybody's constitutional rights because it will allow a State to give final determination as it relates to federal elections, and that is as unconstitutional as anything that can take place.

Madam Speaker, I think that it is incumbent upon the Federal Government, the Congress, the House of Representatives, and the Senate to do what is necessary to make sure that the United States Constitution still reigns supreme.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina for his comments. He clearly acted, as I indicated, and that is, he presented the history, but he brought us to the 21st century and 2021. I think the challenge that we are now offering to the American people, incredulously, how can anyone try to undermine the votes of any American, and particularly those Americans of color?

As I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, let me at least just depict for a moment the uniqueness of our history, for this picture is a picture

of a whipped, beaten back of a slave. That means that we had extraordinary conditions, extraordinary circumstances. In the 1800s preceding and around the Emancipation Proclamation, I will just read these words as I yield: Congress put forward the 15th Amendment and it made it very clear that:

No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political subdivision in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the rights of any citizen of the United States to vote on the account of race, or color, or language minority status.

This was coming out of slavery when they had the 13th Amendment that eliminated slavery but didn't eliminate stigma and institutional racism, gave due process, and then gave the right to vote out of the history of what is depicted here. That is why this is so serious that an institutional rule cannot survive over the right to vote, and the big lie cannot supersede the right to vote.

It is my pleasure to yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), who is a historian and professor in her own right and spent her life's work teaching at historically Black colleges which were born out of the seeds or born out of the quagmire and the fires of slavery but born to make a difference. She has been a champion for the HBCUs and understands what the denial of the vote and voting rights means to that constituency.

□ 2045

Ms. ADAMS. Madam Speaker, I thank the coanchor, SHEILA JACKSON LEE. I thank her for her stellar leadership and all of her diligent work and labor in this vineyard.

To the dynamic coanchor, the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES), I thank him so very much.

To our illustrious chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I am so very proud of her work and very proud of her leadership, and I thank her so much.

Power is what makes the difference in lives and communities. The first thing you have to understand about power and how to get it: You don't ask somebody how to get it, where it is, if you can have it. You take it.

Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about our most fundamental right in a democracy, the power of the vote, the right to vote.

While we have made amazing strides over the past century—votes for women, voting rights for Native Americans and indigenous people, the end of racist Jim Crow laws that completely suppressed the Black votes in certain States, and lowering the voting age to 18—we are still marching because the promise of one person, one vote continues to be abridged by State legislatures across the country.

Marches, sit-ins, and protests are part of our rights as Americans, but we

shouldn't have to March 245 years after the Declaration of Independence. We shouldn't have to march 151 years after the 15th Amendment guaranteed Black Americans the right to vote. We shouldn't have to march a full century after women's suffrage.

But we will continue to march, and we will continue to make our voices heard until every adult citizen can freely, fairly, and easily access the ballot. To cast a vote is at the core of what it means to be American. It is how we build a more perfect Union.

Here in the House, we have passed voting rights bills that bring us closer to a more perfect Union. As we await the support of our Senate colleagues on this urgent matter, the issue of voting rights, I want to leave you with this because I have to tell you that, in my State of North Carolina, there is a lot of mischief going on, and there has been for a number of years.

As the gentlewoman knows, my district was considered to be the district that they described as "surgical precision." It continues to be a problem.

I have been a State legislator for 20 years. I have witnessed legislation that targets African Americans with almost surgical precision and imposes cures for problems that did not exist—that is, unless you think African Americans voting is a problem.

Congress cannot tolerate State-level attempts to curb our most fundamental right. Now is the time to make sure that every American who can vote has the opportunity to do so. This is our power, our message.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her pointed message about North Carolina and her district. I think I join her. My district is a voting rights district, so we know what it is to be at the edge of surviving.

The only way that we have survived is with the protection of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. We are living testimony that it is crucial to the vast diversity that has been created in this House on behalf of the American people.

Madam Speaker, let me now take the pleasure of yielding to another distinguished Member who has had her own history in a very unique State.

Someone asked the question: Is it Southern? Is it Northern? I think you only have to hear her—and, of course, the President of the United States, who is a very forthright leader. President Joe Biden and Vice President HARRIS have been forthright in confronting issues that have been meant to help the American people heal and unite. She has been right in the mix and, as well, has been a leader on labor issues, a leader on healthcare issues. But one thing she knows is the depth of disparity that plagues a community when voting is extinguished.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Madam Speaker, I thank Congresswoman SHEI-

LA JACKSON LEE for her leadership and the things that she does to protect all of us across the country, not just in her district but across the country. We are greatly indebted to her for her service.

The gentlewoman mentioned me coming from the State of Delaware and whether it is Southern or Northern. Many people might not know, but we are on the Mason-Dixon Line. We are urban, suburban, rural, and coastal. But we are also on that Mason-Dixon Line with that strong history.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and her coanchor, Mr. TORRES, and I thank our esteemed chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus, JOYCE BEATTY.

Madam Speaker, I stand before you tonight with a sense of urgency because the most fundamental and sacred right we have as Americans is under attack.

Across this country, State lawmakers have introduced at least 389 restrictive bills in 48 States just this year, and 14 States have already enacted more restrictive voting laws. Even the highest court in the land is chipping away at this fundamental right.

We know that those who would engage in suppression, subversion, and intimidation are not resting, but neither is the Congressional Black Caucus. Tonight, we are standing up and speaking out because we know that just as our message is our power so, too, is our vote.

I am going to say that again: Our vote is our power.

We are here to protect and defend that right because the vote is tied to everything. The vote is tied to criminal justice reform. The vote is tied to healthcare. The vote is tied to the minimum wage increase across this country and access to affordable childcare. It is tied to the preservation of our democracy. It is tied to our very existence: the ability to drink clean water, breathe air that is free of pollution, and even to have a planet to live on.

Everything is tied to the vote, and the vote is on the line.

While we are fighting a new battle, it is the same old tactics that we have seen before. And it is a future we are not going back to.

Yesterday, we lost another American civil rights leader and educator, Bob Moses. One of the many things that he was known for was Freedom Summer, a project to organize and register voters. Through intimidation and beating, Bob Moses never relented in his mission to register voters in the South.

Sixty years later, it is our turn to answer the question that Bob asked of students, a question that goes to the very core of who we are: What kind of society will we be?

Today, the CBC is here to proclaim loudly and proudly: We will be the kind of society that values every voice, empowers every citizen, and counts every vote because it is all on the line. We must pass and have signed into law

H.R. 1, the For the People Act, and H.R. 4, the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

In honor of Bob Moses, let's make this the Freedom Summer of our time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for mentioning Bob Moses.

For those of us who care and know about history, we know about Bob Moses, and it makes this night even more significant because if you are losing the peaceful warriors who helped organize and put themselves on the line, then we must carry on. I thank the gentlewoman from Delaware.

Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 17 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me make an argument regarding where we are, and then I will be happy to yield to my coanchor and happy to conclude.

Madam Speaker, I wanted to reemphasize where we are today and reemphasize that, unfortunately, a bill that had been passed as bipartisan for years has been "upheavaled" by the Supreme Court. Unfortunately, a Supreme Court that, as my friend from New York described, is an activist Supreme Court—the Shelby Court and now the Brnovich Court, absolutely wrongheaded decisions.

In Shelby, I believe the late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg said that you don't throw away an umbrella in a rainstorm.

Now, let me characterize these words and not attribute them. I think one of the other points that was made is: Just because polio is not on the rise, you don't get rid of the polio vaccine. Just because you think COVID-19 is gone, you don't throw all manner of precautions to the wind.

Obviously, we see what is happening with this kind of reckless behavior and this kind of red State, blue State discord. People are dying.

That is where we are with voting rights. The Shelby case in 2013 just imploded the preclearance, which in actuality says that as you begin to think about a bill that may have these discriminatory impacts, they can be precleared by the Department of Justice and stopped in their tracks. Section 2 says the harm has been done, and you can run into court making the argument that it is discriminatory.

Tragically, all we were left with, before the Brnovich case, was section 2. But here, what has happened in this case that came out of Arizona—a place where the big lie is playing out every day with a false and misleading and disreputable vote count. To my colleague, I don't know what they found yet, but it is certainly one that has no basis in fact.

The Court in Brnovich suggested that they would have something called guideposts—I call them burdens or suggestions—that when reviewing claims that are facially so-called neutral elec-

tion policy, practice, or voting rule, and it is discriminating, you can look at these aspects.

You can burden us by saying, "Here is what you look at." Are they ordinary burdens or mere inconvenience exception, the size of disparities and burdens imposed by the challenge rule, other opportunities to vote provided by a State's election system.

So, the polls are closed. You can't do a mail ballot. You don't have Souls to the Polls. So, just find some other way to vote.

That is the question. They say, "other opportunities to vote." You close out all the other supporting aspects of voting, and maybe you can get to vote in a snowstorm. Maybe you can get to vote as a military person in battle. Maybe you can show up to the voting poll on election day because that is another opportunity. Maybe you can get on a plane and leave battle to vote. These are the just nonsensical aspects of the Brnovich case.

Legitimate State interests justifying the challenge voting rule—oh, there is a State interest to close your polling locations in minority neighborhoods, to not have places to get a voter ID in eight counties in Texas when you have a law that says you must have a voting ID, or to close out Souls to the Polls, a perfectly legal concept to allow people who work around the clock through a Sunday to go vote. I guess you would tell them to just find another opportunity.

When we were in the middle of COVID-19 and nurses and doctors were working around the clock, Harris County said: We will give you 24-hour voting.

Legally, law enforcement present, machines in order, no fraud detected at all, but you are fighting COVID, and you might not get off until 1 a.m., 3 a.m., 4 a.m.

Yet, this is what the big lie brings about, and then the degree to which a voting rule departs from what was a standard practice when section 2 was amended in 1982.

Now, the crisis of this is that all of this must be run down for you to be able to prevail under section 2, under the Brnovich case.

Taken together, this Supreme Court cabal is saying to racial, ethnic, and language minorities already intimidated—and you need to look at what John Lewis faced in 1965, this brute force, law enforcement on horses chasing foot soldiers back over the bridge, 8-year-olds running for their lives, and bloodied older persons, foot soldiers, and John Robert Lewis, who said he thought he was going to die.

□ 2100

That is what sacrifice has been made for voting. Taken together, this court decision is saying: What is the big deal? It is only voting. Just like with bad weather, sometimes you just have to grin and bear it and have a little inconvenience. Just a little bit of dis-

crimination. Why are you concerned about that?

And so I assume that without the 24th amendment, that this conservative majority and the court will subject poll taxes and literacy tests to the review standard enunciated in Brnovich. Just a little bit of inconvenience. Take that money out and pay that poll tax. You don't have any money? I guess your fundamental right to vote has just been extinguished.

That is where we are today. That is why we are here today challenging the filibuster, speaking about the Federalist papers nullification, and trying to understand that the Constitution prevails over all of these miserly bills across the Nation. The 15th amendment and then the Constitution statement, very clearly says that Congress, that no one can nullify or stop your rights as a person that is elected to Congress because they have no rights.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article, an op-ed, that I submitted on June 26, 2021, authored by myself.

WHERE GOP LAWMAKERS HAVE PASSED NEW VOTING RESTRICTIONS AROUND THE COUNTRY

Republican state legislators have introduced hundreds of bills that would tighten access to voting around the country, many of them echoing former president Donald Trump's false claims that loose election laws allowed fraud to taint the 2020 White House race.

The groundswell began early this year with the introduction of 253 bills proposing voting restrictions across 43 states as of mid-February, according to the nonpartisan Brennan Center for Justice. That number rose to at least 389 bills in 48 states as of mid-May.

The national spotlight is now on Texas after Democratic lawmakers left the state on July 12 in an effort to block passage of one of the most stringent new voting measures in the country. Texas Gov. Greg Abbott (R) said the members could face arrest when they return, which is not expected until the state's special legislative session concludes—potentially as late as Aug. 7.

Across the country, 17 states have enacted laws this year that tighten the rules around casting ballots and running elections, according to the nonpartisan Voting Rights Lab, which tracks developments in state election law.

Many of the bills target mail voting and other policies that helped safeguard the franchise during the coronavirus pandemic and produce the highest turnout among American voters in more than a century.

Some of the bills also seek to curtail early voting, impose restrictions on voter registration efforts, limit the power of local officials to oversee elections and stop private donors from supplementing their operational budgets.

Democratic-controlled states have moved in the other direction, approving measures to formalize more permissive voting policies from 2020, complementing proposed federal legislation to protect voting rights with a set of national standards.

In addition to the states listed below, Alabama, Arkansas, Idaho, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, North Dakota, New Hampshire, Nevada, Tennessee, Texas, Utah and Wyoming have also passed laws with restrictive language.

STATES WITH SIGNIFICANT NEW VOTING
RESTRICTIONS*Arizona—Enacted May 11 and June 30*

Republicans in Arizona changed the state's popular Permanent Early Voting List, which determines who receives mail ballots each election cycle.

The new rules mean voters who do not cast a ballot at least once every two years will have to respond to a government notice to avoid being removed from the list and to continue getting a ballot in the mail.

Another measure, signed into law on June 30, stripped power from Democratic Secretary of State Katie Hobbs, allowed third parties designated by the legislature to flag ineligible voters for removal from the rolls and provided funds for election security and post-election recounts.

Florida—Enacted May 6

New state law signed May 6 institutes a number of changes, including requiring voters to renew their mail voting application every two years and to submit a form of identification.

With some exceptions, voters' access to drop boxes for returning mail ballots will be limited to early voting hours, a maximum of 12 hours per day.

If any drop box is found to be accessible outside of these hours, the local supervisor of elections could be subject to a civil penalty of \$25,000.

Voters will be permitted to drop off only two ballots for nonfamily members.

The law gives partisan election observers more access to the ballot counting process.

It also prevents behavior undertaken with the "intent" of influencing a voter, so the law is likely to bar efforts to provide food and water to people waiting in line to cast in-person ballots.

Donations to election budgets from private individuals are also not allowed.

Georgia—Enacted March 25

Georgia's new voting law signed by Gov. Brian Kemp (R) on March 25 imposes a number of restrictions on voting in the state, earning it comparisons to the Jim Crow laws that effectively blocked Black men and women from voting in the American South.

Specifically, the rules prevent proactively sending mail ballot applications to voters, require voters to submit identification with their application to be approved and shorten the time frame for the application process to take place.

Like several other states, Georgia added new restrictions on the use of mail ballot drop boxes and prohibited providing food or water to people waiting in line to vote in person. Legislators also stripped certain powers from the secretary of state, removing that official as chair of the State Election Board and allowing the General Assembly to select his or her replacement.

Iowa—Enacted March 8

New Iowa voting law shortens the application period for mail ballots and bars election officials from proactively sending application forms to voters.

County auditors can face criminal charges if they do not follow certain procedures in purging voter rolls.

The early voting period—and voting hours on Election Day are shorter.

Local officials' discretion in placing drop boxes is curtailed.

WHAT TO WATCH IN COMING WEEKS

Texas

One of the most restrictive voting bills in the country was defeated—at least temporarily—in Texas on May 30, when a Democratic walkout in the state House caused the chamber to miss the deadline for passage.

The GOP bills would empower partisan poll watchers and impose stiff penalties on election administrators for actions such as sending unsolicited mail ballot applications to voters.

Comparing the legislation to Jim Crow laws, critics have said it would disproportionately affect people of color.

The measures would prohibit drive-up voting and other methods used widely by Black and Latino voters in Houston to cast ballots during the coronavirus pandemic, as well as create strict signature-matching rules that could force the rejection of valid votes cast by mail.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TORRES), my co-anchor, and I thank him again for his joining me tonight, and for our journey that we are on trying to raise up justice in this country.

Mr. TORRES of New York. Madam Speaker, both the 2020 and 2021 election cycles have been a powerful testament to the influence of the Black vote.

I proudly come from New York State where we have seen a golden age of Black political power: the attorney general, the State Senate majority leader, the State assembly speaker, the mayor, are all Black.

And we know that but for the Black vote, President Biden would have never won the Presidency, and the Democrats never would have won a majority in the Senate. And the attempts at voter suppression that we have seen threatens to reverse the racial progress that has been made.

Increasingly, we are becoming a multiracial democracy. You know, 70 percent of the Democratic Caucus consists of people of color, women, and members of the LGBTQ community. But you would never know that from the structure of the Senate. The structure of the Senate concentrates power in a small subset of States that are much whiter, much more rural, much more conservative than the rest of the country.

Before the Democratic party won the Senate in 2021, the Senate Republican majority represented 10 to 15 million fewer people than the Senate Democratic minority. And the problem is that the filibuster takes the undemocratic structure of the Senate to an even greater extreme.

The notion that one Senator, who represents a State smaller than our congressional districts, should have the power to overturn the will of the President and the Senate and the House, is profoundly undemocratic. It makes an absurdity of the democratic process.

One particularly egregious example of the filibuster can be found in the area of gun safety. In a rational world, every gun would be registered and safely stored. Every gun owner would be licensed and trained. Every gun sale would be subject to a background check.

But there is nothing rational about a political system that enables one Senator from a State smaller than my congressional district to filibuster gun safety at the expense of 330 million Americans.

Name any cause: LGBTQ equality, voting rights enforcement, immigration reform, democracy reform, criminal justice reform, all of these causes have died at the hands of the filibuster.

I would submit to you that we have a party in America that is intent on holding power at any cost and by any means necessary. If the Republican party cannot win democratically, then it will insist on winning undemocratically through voter suppression, gerrymandering, the structure of the Senate, the electoral college, right-wing judicial activism on the Supreme Court. All of these are means of holding onto power by any means necessary. All of these are means of subverting democracy at any cost. That is the challenge that lies before us.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York. I am so glad he said the words "by any means necessary." That is striking, and without a doubt, the approach of the activist Supreme Court, right-wing, of the big lies, and of those who wish to stall and stop the very lifeline of American democracy, and that is the right of each person to vote their conscious.

As we have said: Our message, our power; but our voice, our vote; our vote, our voice. And I thank him for joining me this evening for elaborating and detailing and roll-calling where we are today.

I notice the gentleman did not step in the breach and indicate that we might need to expand the Court. That is another discussion altogether.

Madam Speaker, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. BUSH), a member of the Judiciary Committee. I think she can speak in her own way on the vitality of a vote for poor people.

Ms. BUSH. Madam Speaker, I thank the chairwoman for this moment to be able to address about something that I still have trouble understanding the need to address when people fell, when people bled, when people died, and we are still here. And all of that happened, so much of it happened before I was even born, even thought of, and we are still here.

So, St. Louis and I, we rise today, because in Missouri our right to vote is being taken away. Taken away from many of us. And by us, let me be clear that I mean Black folks, I mean Brown folks, I mean Indigenous folks.

□ 2110

Despite the raising of our voices, despite the marching of our feet, and despite our turning out the vote to deliver the government to Democrats, the Senate has yet to do anything about it. H.R. 1 is gathering dust in the Senate, and the filibuster remains intact. With every passing day, the reality of the situation worsens.

Yet, rather than acting with urgency, some have even suggested instead we want to out-organize voter suppression.

After an election year when Black, Brown, and indigenous organizers gave their blood, their sweat, and their tears to deliver a Democratic House, Senate, and White House. A year when Black women turned the longtime red State of Georgia blue. When Black, Brown, and indigenous voters stood in disproportionately long lines to cast their ballots on an election day that is not a Federal holiday. A year when Black, Brown, and indigenous communities have been disproportionately harmed by this pandemic, yet turned out in the face of these suppression tactics to vote in record numbers.

We did this because we were promised justice. We were promised that our right to vote would be secure, and we were promised a sustainable future.

But rather than deliver on these promises, we were asked again to give our blood, our sweat, and our tears?

To those who say just out-organize rather than legislate, I say shame. Shame, Madam Speaker, that you take our labor for granted. Shame that you take our struggle for granted, and shame that your promises continue to go unfulfilled. Like my chairwoman said, we have people who are living, struggling, burdened, and oppressed in ways that others aren't, and are the ones who suffer the most.

Shame that rather than doing everything within your power, Madam Speaker, to deliver us the future, we are being asked to overcome voter suppression again.

To those who are telling us just to out-organize voter suppression, my message to you is this: We already did.

Thank you, Madam Speaker for recognizing me to anchor this Special Order on the fierce urgency of preserving the precious right to vote by passing H.R. 4, the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act, and legislation like H.R. 1, the For The People Act.

I am delighted to be co-anchoring this Congressional Black Caucus Special Order at the request of our tireless leader for justice, Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY of Ohio, and to be joined by co-anchor, Congressman RITCHIE TORRES of New York, and many members of the CBC.

Before I begin, Madam Speaker, let me share some history and important numbers with our colleagues and the nation that show for most of the past 56 years, support for the Voting Rights Act and protecting, preserving, and expanding the right to vote of all Americans has been an issue that Americans have supported in overwhelming numbers all across the nation.

On July 9, 1965, House passed the Voting Rights Act by a 333–85 vote, with Democrats voting 221–61 and Republicans 112–24.

House later approved the VRA conference report on August 3 by a 328–74 vote (Democrats 217–54, Republicans 111–20).

The Senate passed the VRA on August 4 by a 79–18 vote, with Democrats voting 49–17 and Republicans 30–1.

This landmark legislation, P.L. 89–10, was signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson as on August 6, 1965.

Five years later, on June 22, 1970, the VRA was renewed for five years as Public Law 91–

285, passing the House by a vote of 272–132 and the Senate by a vote of 64–12.

Five years later, on June 4, 1975, Congress extended the VRA for seven years, enacting Public Law 94–73, with majorities of 341–70 in the House and 77–12 in the Senate.

On June 29, 1982, a Republican-controlled Senate joined with a Democratic House to pass Public Law 97–205, extending the VRA for 10 years, with the vote in the Senate of 85–8 and the vote in the House of 389–24.

Ten years later, the bipartisan Voting Rights Language Assistance Act was passed as Public Law 102–344 on August 26, 1992.

And on July 27, 2006, the Voting Rights Act was extended for 25 years when the Congress passed Public Law 109–246 (H.R. 9), the Fannie Lou Hamer, Rosa Parks, and Coretta Scott King Voting Rights Act Reauthorization and Amendments Act of 2006.

The vote for H.R. 9 was 390–33 in the House and 98–0 in the Senate.

Madam Speaker, every extension of the Voting Rights Act recounted above was signed into law by a Republican President, from Richard Nixon to Gerald Ford to Ronald Reagan to George H.W. Bush, and George W. Bush.

This chain of bipartisan support for voting rights stood solid and unbreakable until the Supreme Court's horrendous decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* 570 U.S. 529 (2013).

PROTECTING AND PRESERVING VOTING RIGHTS

Madam Speaker, the serious damage to the precious right to vote occasioned by the right-wing, conservative majority on the Supreme Court demands that Congress exercise its powers under Section 5 of the 15th Amendment to restore the extraordinary reach and effectiveness of Section 2 and Section 5 of the Voting Rights Act.

As an aside, Madam Speaker, on the objection of VRA opponents to states subject preclearance having the burden to bail themselves out, I have long said that the states that were subject to preclearance under the Voting Rights Act earned their way in, so it only fitting that they earn their way out.

Madam Speaker, June 25, 2021, marked the 8th anniversary of the Supreme Court's infamous decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 529 (2013), which immobilized the Department of Justice from subjecting discriminatory voting and election law changes to prior review and approval, or "preclearance."

It was predicted at the time by me and other defenders of the precious right to vote that the Court's misguided and naïve decision would usher in a wave of state and local initiatives intended to suppress and nullify the rights of black Americans, persons of color, young adults, and marginalized communities to exercise the most basic act in the political process: voting.

As we have seen in recent months, this prediction has tragically come to pass.

Not to be content with the monument to disgrace that is the *Shelby* decision, the activist right-wing conservative majority on the Roberts Court, on July 1, 2021, issued its evil twin, the decision in the Arizona case of *Brnovich v. DNC*, 594 U.S. ___, No. 19–1257 and 19–1258 (July 1, 2021), which engrafts on Section 2 of the Voting Rights onerous burdens that Congress never intended and explicitly legislated against to ensure that:

"No voting qualification or prerequisite to voting or standard, practice, or procedure shall be imposed or applied by any State or political

subdivision in a manner which results in a denial or abridgement of the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color, or language minority status."

Among these burdens, couched as "guideposts," or "suggestions" are that when reviewing claims that a facially neutral election law, policy, practice, or voting rule has a discriminator, and therefore unlawful, effect on minority citizens, courts are to consider the following matters:

1. An "ordinary burdens" or "mere inconvenience" exception;
2. Size of disparities in burdens imposed by the challenged rule;
3. Other opportunities to vote provided by a state's election system;
4. Legitimate state interests justifying the challenged voting rule; and
5. The degree to which a voting rule departs from what was standard practice when Section 2 was amended in 1982.

Taken together, this Supreme Court cabal is saying to racial, ethnic, and language minorities: "What's the big deal, it's only voting. Just like with bad weather, sometimes you just have grin and bear a little inconvenience."

This Supreme Court majority has simply never understood, or refuses to accept, the fundamental importance of the right to vote, free of discriminatory hurdles and obstacles.

Madam Speaker, were it not for the 24th Amendment, I venture to say that this conservative majority on the Court would subject poll taxes and literacy tests to the review standard enunciated in *Brnovich v. DNC*.

Their predecessors on the Court understood this, going back at least as far as 1938, when the Supreme Court held in Chief Justice Hughes' famous Footnote 4 in *United States v. Carolene Products*, 304 U.S. 144 (1938), that government action alleged to discriminate against "discrete and insular minorities" would be subject to "strict scrutiny" by reviewing courts.

Madam Speaker, you might be asking who are these "discrete and insular minorities" about whom the Court was referring?

The answer is they were and are persons "excluded from 'those political processes ordinarily to be relied upon to protect' them, racial and language minorities, and aliens, all of whom were denied the single most important tool for protecting and advancing one's interests in a democracy: the right to vote.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the record of this hearing, a June 26, 2021 op-ed authored by me entitled "A Strong Voting Rights Act Is Needed Now More Than Ever."

It is useful, Madam Speaker, to recount how we arrived at this day.

Madam Speaker, fifty-six years ago, in Selma, Alabama, hundreds of heroic souls risked their lives for freedom and to secure the right to vote for all Americans by their participation in marches for voting rights on "Bloody Sunday," "Turnaround Tuesday," or the final, completed march from Selma to Montgomery.

Those "foot soldiers" of Selma, brave and determined men and women, boys and girls, persons of all races and creeds, loved their country so much that they were willing to risk their lives to make it better, to bring it even closer to its founding ideals.

The foot soldiers marched because they believed that all persons have dignity and the right to equal treatment under the law, and in the making of the laws, which is the fundamental essence of the right to vote.

On that day, Sunday, March 7, 1965, more than 600 civil rights demonstrators, including our beloved former colleague, the late Congressman John Lewis of Georgia, were brutally attacked by state and local police at the Edmund Pettus Bridge as they marched from Selma to Montgomery in support of the right to vote.

"Bloody Sunday" was a defining moment in American history because it crystallized for the nation the necessity of enacting a strong and effective federal law to protect the right to vote of every American.

No one who witnessed the violence and brutally suffered by the foot soldiers for justice who gathered at the Edmund Pettus Bridge will ever forget it; the images are deeply seared in the American memory and experience.

On August 6, 1965, in the Rotunda of the Capitol and in the presence of such luminaries as the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Rev. Ralph Abernathy of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Roy Wilkins of the NAACP; Whitney Young of the National Urban League; James Foreman of the Congress of Racial Equality; A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; John Lewis of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee; Senators Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and Everett Dirksen; President Johnson addressed the nation before signing the Voting Rights Act: "The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men."

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was critical to preventing brazen voter discrimination violations that historically left millions of African Americans disenfranchised.

In 1940, for example, there were less than 30,000 African Americans registered to vote in Texas and only about 3 percent of African Americans living in the South were registered to vote.

Poll taxes, literacy tests, and threats of violence were the major causes of these racially discriminatory results.

After passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, which prohibited these discriminatory practices, registration and electoral participation steadily increased to the point that by 2012, more than 1.2 million African Americans living in Texas were registered to vote.

In 1964, the year before the Voting Rights Act became law, there were approximately 300 African-Americans in public office, including just three in Congress.

Few, if any, African Americans held elective office anywhere in the South.

Because of the Voting Rights Act, in 2007 there were more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 46 members of Congress, the largest number ever.

Madam Speaker, the Voting Rights Act opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Hispanic public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including more than 275 at the state or federal level, 32 of whom serve in Congress.

Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

As I indicated, the crown jewel of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is Section 5, which requires that states and localities with a chronic

record of discrimination in voting practices secure federal approval before making any changes to voting processes.

Section 5 has protected minority voting rights where voter discrimination has historically been the worst.

Between 1982 and 2006, Section 5 stopped more than 1,000 discriminatory voting changes in their tracks, including 107 discriminatory changes right here in Texas.

Passed in 1965 with the extraordinary leadership of President Lyndon Johnson, the greatest legislative genius of our lifetime, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 was bringing dramatic change in many states across the South.

But in 1972, change was not coming fast enough or in many places in Texas.

In fact, Texas, which had never elected a woman to Congress or an African American to the Texas State Senate, was not covered by Section 5 of the 1965 Voting Rights Act and the language minorities living in South Texas were not protected at all.

But thanks to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the tireless voter registration work performed in 1972 by Hillary Clinton in Texas, along "With hundreds of others, including her future husband Bill, Barbara Jordan was elected to Congress, giving meaning to the promise of the Voting Rights Act that all citizens would at long last have the right to cast a vote for person of their community, from their community, for their community."

Madam Speaker, it is a source of eternal pride to all of us in Houston that in pursuit of extending the full measure of citizenship to all Americans, in 1975 Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who also represented this historic 18th Congressional District of Texas, introduced, and the Congress adopted, what are now Sections 4(f)(3) and 4(f)(4) of the Voting Rights Act, which extended the protections of Section 4(a) and Section 5 to language minorities.

During the floor debate on the 1975 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, Congresswoman Jordan explained why this reform was needed:

"There are Mexican-American people in the State of Texas who have been denied the right to vote; who have been impeded in their efforts to register and vote; who have not had encouragement from those election officials because they are brown people."

"So, the state of Texas, if we approve this measure, would be brought "within the coverage of this Act for the first time."

When it comes to extending and protecting the precious right to vote, the Lone Star State—the home state of Lyndon Johnson and Barbara Jordan—could be the leading state in the Union, one that sets the example for the nation.

But to realize that future, Texas must turn from and not return to the dark days of the past.

By embracing the discriminatory Texas SB7 and the "Big Lie" that the 2020 election, by all accounts adjudged the most secure and inclusive in American history, was riven by voter fraud, Texas Republicans are making the wrong choice to their eternal shame.

Texans must remain ever vigilant and oppose all schemes that will abridge or dilute the precious right to vote, like the odious Texas SB7 recently passed by the Texas State Senate but killed, but not yet permanently, by the unity and courage of Democrats in the Texas State House of Representatives.

Madam Speaker, I applaud the House Democrats of the Texas General Assembly for being on the front lines, fighting in opposition to Texas SB7 on the House floor and I join with them in calling upon the U.S. Senate to eliminate the filibuster and to bring to the floor for debate and vote—so Congress can pass—H.R. 1 and H.R. 4, the John Lewis Voting Rights Advancement Act.

We must all do our part to preserve this most important heritage because it was earned with the sacrifices and the lives of our ancestors.

The right to vote is a "powerful instrument that can break down the walls of injustice" and must be protected against attack from all enemies, foreign and domestic, using all the legal tools at our disposal.

Madam Speaker, the right to vote and to participate meaningfully in civic and political affairs has done more to advance the cause of freedom, justice, and equality than the Second Amendment has ever done, if it has done anything at all.

It is time the Congress act to protect and expand the right to vote, the only right that is preservative of every other right.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD an article titled "John Lewis leaves behind a powerful legacy of social justice."

[From the Washington Post, July 19, 2020]

JOHN LEWIS LEAVES BEHIND A POWERFUL
LEGACY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

(By Peniel E. Joseph)

On July 17, congressman and civil rights leader John Lewis died at 80, on the same day as 95-year-old stalwart C.T. Vivian, Martin Luther King's favorite preacher. Both leave behind a legacy of social justice activism that played a pivotal role in some of the most resounding victories of the civil rights movement: America's Second Reconstruction.

Lewis's death comes at a critical moment in U.S. history, amid a moral and political reckoning on black dignity and citizenship that represents nothing less than a Third American Reconstruction. And his life provides lessons for activists today on how to confront racial violence, forge productive alliances and transform American democracy.

Born in 1940 in Troy, Ala., to a family of sharecropping farmers, the deeply religious Lewis joined the movement for black dignity and citizenship as a student activist in Nashville. Already enthralled by the dazzling oratory of the young Martin Luther King Jr., Lewis enjoyed an unusual kind of political apprenticeship under the mentorship of an array of movement leaders. He learned the practical application of nonviolent civil disobedience from the Rev. James Lawson and became fast friends with fellow student activists such as Diane Nash. Ella Baker, founder of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee (SNCC, pronounced "snick"), played a critical role in convincing students such as Lewis that they—and not just King and older generations of preachers—could play pivotal leadership roles in an unfolding national drama.

Lewis's calm demeanor, personal sincerity and outward humility made him a quiet star among student leaders. He was arrested dozens of times for civil rights activism between 1960 and 1966. In 1961, he joined hundreds of volunteers on Freedom Rides, traveling throughout the Jim Crow South to challenge segregated bus terminals. On May 14, 1961, Lewis experienced a vicious beating at the hands of a white mob as a Freedom Rider in Anniston, Ala. It was the first of many brutal experiences he endured as an activist,

and such punishment bolstered Lewis's political resolve to defeat racial segregation.

Elected chairman of SNCC in 1963, Lewis became the youngest national civil rights leader of the 1960s. At 23, he was the youngest speaker at the March on Washington on Aug. 28, 1963. Although parts of the collectively written speech were abandoned after objections from white allies in the movement, Lewis prepared the nation for continued racial combat in the service of justice. "By the force of our demands, our determination and our numbers, we shall splinter the desegregated South into a thousand pieces and pull them back together in the image of God and democracy," he argued.

Lewis effectively navigated between student militants in SNCC—which craved transformational political change radical enough to protect black life in the Mississippi Delta and Alabama black belt—and more pragmatic civil rights leaders who viewed the Democratic Party as the most effective vehicle for widespread social change. In 1964, Lewis encountered Malcolm X while touring Africa in hopes of forging international alliances to strengthen domestic black freedom struggles and came away from his meeting impressed with the black nationalist icon's willingness to explore political alliances with civil rights leaders.

On March 7, 1965, Lewis, dressed in a crisp white shirt, tie, raincoat and backpack, joined several hundred demonstrators crossing the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Selma, Ala., who were routed by blue-helmeted state troopers. The violence that afternoon left Lewis with permanent scars on his head. But the activists' resolve in the face of violent opposition helped trigger the moral and political outrage that led to the passage of voting rights legislation. Lewis's involvement at that moment made visible to the whole nation the violent, racist dehumanization of black people.

In May 1966, Stokely Carmichael, the charismatic Howard University activist and friend turned organizational rival, replaced Lewis as SNCC chairman. Carmichael's call for "Black Power!" the next month during a civil rights demonstration in Mississippi helped to transform the aesthetics of the black freedom struggle. Lewis completed his college degree at Fisk University at the moment when Black Power activists were calling for a dramatic and radical restructuring of American democracy. The political vision of Black Power activists, despite political disagreements with Carmichael and SNCC, inspired Lewis, who used the racial solidarity forged in the crucible of the movement as a springboard to political office.

As the radical hopes of the 1960s faded in the aftermath of King's assassination on April 4, 1968, Lewis turned to electoral politics. In 1986, he won the Georgia congressional seat he would hold until his death in an ugly political battle with Julian Bond, the charismatic SNCC activist and former friend turned bitter adversary. Over the next 34 years, Lewis went from staring down the forces of white supremacy at bus stations and bridges to confronting these same adversaries in the U.S. Congress. Bringing organizing skills learned as an activist and radical ideas about transforming American life, he fought valiantly for health-care, gun-control and anti-poverty legislation. During the late 1980s and 1990s as the nation turned away from the vision of the "Beloved Community" outlined at the March on Washington, Lewis advocated for a return to the anti-poverty and anti-racist policies that briefly flourished during the 1960s.

The American political establishment, over time, caught up with his accomplishments. Barack Obama's watershed presidential election proved a boon to Lewis's po-

litical legacy, with the first black president acknowledging the congressman's towering achievements with a Presidential Medal of Freedom. Lewis recognized Obama's ascent as part of a political harvest reaped from the bloodstained sacrifices of earlier generations.

Lewis understood that those struggles for black dignity and citizenship continued during his lifetime. He embraced the Black Lives Matter movement, including the recent national and global protests for racial justice and equality in the aftermath of George Floyd's killing at the hands of police. "It is so much more massive and all-inclusive," Lewis noted of Black Lives Matter. Whereas black women, including those who helped to nurture Lewis and lead the movement, were excluded from speaking at the March on Washington in 1963, he marveled to witness the prominence of black women in the BLM movement—as featured leaders, organizers and strategists. As an elder statesman within political and civil rights circles, Lewis continued to encourage the young to lead a movement he recognized as continuing into our own time.

Lewis's extraordinary life offers important lessons for contemporary generations organizing for black equality in America and around the world. His example teaches us that movements for racial justice have always been denigrated by authorities and been targets of violence by political, legislative and military bodies. Young people who refused to heed the warnings of an older generation helped to transform American democracy, but they received crucial mentoring from a council of elders who believed, like Baker, that strong people did not require charismatic top-down patriarchal leadership. To the contrary, young activists could be trusted to ask the right questions that would lead to what Lewis called the "good trouble" capable of ending systemic racism, structural violence and white supremacy.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, the right to vote free from intimidation or obstacle is the most precious right of any American citizen, a pillar of our democratic system. And when that right, that pillar, is threatened for anyone, it is a threat to us all—to our democracy and to our very way of life.

For Texans, this fight is personal. Earlier this year, Republican lawmakers in the Texas Legislature introduced a series of new voting laws, yet antiquated in thought, that would restrict access to the polls for people across the state. Unfortunately, we are all too familiar with these types of efforts to strip our right to vote here in Texas. In fact, I remember having to pay a poll tax when I voted in my first election in Dallas. And although these new efforts are not as blatant as a poll tax, they are equally as confining.

These new waves of voter restriction efforts are not new—and neither is the opposition to them. From our late colleague Congressman John Lewis marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge in 1965, to the extension of the Voting Rights Act in 2006, to the Texas Democrats breaking quorum to prevent the passage of restrictive voting laws this month. It is incumbent upon us to keep alive that opposition to similar efforts, and to inform and inspire the next generation to do the same.

It is in that spirit that I, once again, call on the Senate to pass H.R. 1, the For the People Act. We can no longer afford the cost of inaction on this issue. This fight is about the future

of Texas, it's about the future of the United States, and it's about the future of democracy.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, this month marked the one-year anniversary of the passing of our dear friend and beloved colleague John Lewis. Sadly, while we reflect upon his legacy, there are efforts underway in State Houses across the nation to turn back the clock and erect barriers to voter participation in elections.

We all know that the premise behind these efforts is a lie—namely, that the 2020 election was stolen and that there was rampant voter fraud. In my home state of Georgia, these falsehoods led to the passage and ultimate enactment of Senate Bill 202, which was given the misleading name, "the Georgia Civics Renewal Act." The lie also provided the impetus for the attack on the United States Capitol on January 6.

The measures being put forward in states like Georgia reduce voter access to the polls under the guise of protecting the vote. Georgia's SB 202 limits drop boxes, imposes ID requirements on absentee voting, restricts early voting on weekends, allows state officials to circumvent the work of election officials if they do not like the results they are seeing, and even makes it a crime to offer food and water to voters waiting in line.

It is a ruse that disproportionately impacts voters whose voices have too often been silenced. Why? Because those voices—African American voices in Georgia—made all the difference in 2020.

The integrity of our elections is enhanced by greater voter participation—not less. As Martin Luther King, Jr. once said, "voting is the foundation stone of political action."

Earlier this year, I co-sponsored H.R. 1, For the People Act, which is a voting and elections bill that protects access, promotes the creation of fairer districts, and supports public financing of campaigns. The legislation passed the House on March 3 by a vote of 220 to 210.

I also supported H.R. 4, the John Lewis Voting Rights Enhancement Act, which the House had approved last Congress.

H.R. 4 is intended to fix the enforcement provisions of the original Voting Rights Act that were gutted by the Supreme Court in the 2013 *Shelby County v. Holder* decision.

The Court's conservative majority held that the formula for determining whether jurisdictions were subject to the law's Justice Department pre-clearance procedure for voting and election changes by state and local governments were outdated. This mostly focused on southern states with a long history of racially discriminatory voter suppression.

Contrary to the court's opinion and since then, hundreds of bills across several state legislatures have been proposed that would make access to the ballot box increasingly difficult for many people—more so for communities of color, students, seniors, and disabled people. Some of these bills have become law.

In many cases, those who are rolling back access to the vote are also involved in the decennial redistricting process in which congressional and state legislative maps will be set until 2032.

These are precisely the kind of decisions the Justice Department was able to scrutinize under the pre-*Shelby County* Voting Rights Act.

The John Lewis Voting Rights Enhancement Act will rectify this wrong and fine-tune that

formula so that the Supreme Court cannot strike it down again.

Madam Speaker, I know that John Lewis is looking down upon us now. If he were here with us today, I know that he would be on the House floor tonight and would be imploring us in that booming voice of his to continue the fight for voting rights to which he devoted his life and career.

It is the same fight for which he endured unspeakable brutality while attempting to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge on the march from Selma to Montgomery. We cannot turn back now.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 2021, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ROY) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I have been listening to my friend from Texas, the gentleman from New York, and other speakers, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, and I can't help but observe the reality of the Shelby County decision as it was offered by the United States Supreme Court's majority authored by Chief Justice Roberts.

Now, what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle fail to mention is the fact that the Voting Rights Act remains intact and the Voting Rights Act remains fully in effect, and its purpose to ensure and preserve the ability of Americans to vote remains fully the law of the land. The core question before the Court back in 2012 or 2013—I think it was argued in '12 and decided in '13—was whether section 5, the specific preclearance provision, was, in fact, constitutional.

Now, the fact of the matter is when this was reauthorized back in I think 2006, it was reauthorized based on a 50-year-old coverage formula.

Now, my friend from Texas knows that. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know that it was using a 50-year-old coverage formula. Now, people may want to just kind of sweep that aside and say that doesn't matter, but then go back and read the Supreme Court's opinion in 1966 on the first challenge on the Voting Rights Act and what the Court was saying at the time, that when you set aside the fundamental role of the States in carrying out elections, when you set aside the 10th Amendment, Madam Speaker, as the 1965 Voting Rights Act was seeking to do, well, then there has to be a particularly strong purpose.

What was that particularly strong purpose?

Invidious discrimination of the kind of the Jim Crow South of the poll taxes and of massive disparities in voting rates among populations in districts where those prohibitions existed.

Fast-forward 50 years through several iterations of the reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, and in 2012, 2013, when this was being debated and when the Court decided it, the Court

said: Look, sorry, you can't apply 50-year-old data to uphold and reauthorize the Voting Rights Act.

Now, I know that, because I was a lawyer on the Senate Judiciary Committee, and I pored over every one of those documents that came before us and read and reviewed them sitting as a staffer on the Senate Judiciary Committee where we knew full well what the data was showing us and what the data looked like. But here we are right now and the American people are only hearing that part of the story that we are somehow unwinding the Voting Rights Act.

We have done no such thing.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROY. Out of enormous respect for my friend from Texas, despite the way these hours normally work, I yield briefly to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The gentleman is always enormously courteous, and I will be brief.

Since I was on the committee the gentleman might have been staff, but I know in the House, for example, we had at least 100 hearings and 15,000 pages of testimony. It was chaired at that time by Jim Sensenbrenner, a Republican, who was meticulous in making sure we had a record. So I am not sure where the gentleman is getting his information from.

I will just finish by simply saying that the voter suppression laws that we are dealing with today are all engaged responding to the big lie that there was not a legitimate election in 2020, and my good friend knows that President Joe Biden and KAMALA HARRIS were elected in 2020. So we wonder the basis of these voter suppression laws.

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I will not take more of his time.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman. Let me just say, I think this body would do a wonder for the American people if we could engage in this for hours, not seconds. And I think the gentlewoman agrees that we should have this kind of debate back and forth so the American people can see so we can flush out our differences, because there are things we agree on, and there are things we disagree on.

What I would respond to the gentlewoman about the point of what occurred, poring over it as a staffer as I did, was that the Members, including the chairman of the Judiciary Committee then, Mr. Sensenbrenner, as well as on the Senate side—and I won't speak for the House, because I was on the Senate side—but I was in the room with Chairman Specter, I was in the room with all of those that were in 2006 going through all this, and I was in the room with about 15 Republicans who were sitting over there, each of whom said that it was unconstitutional, we can't really do this, but we dare not go down this political road.

Okay, well, that is what that is.

Fast-forward, and for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to bemoan "activist Courts," well, welcome to the club. Welcome to the party of being concerned about activist Courts. I would argue this is not activism, but, fine, let's have that debate about how much power we want to cede to the building over there across the street, because when we are talking about activism, we can go way back on activism in terms of our views in terms of Roe, in terms of Planned Parenthood v. Casey, and other areas in which the Court has inserted itself into the public domain.

But, okay, here we are. The legislature acted, and the Court said: Whoa, whoa, you can't do that.

Why did they do that? Applying the 10th Amendment, applying fundamentals of federalism, and applying the fact that States have primacy over election laws.

That is what the Court did. If you believe in judicial review subsequent to *Marbury v. Madison*, as I believe my friend from Texas, who is now leaving the floor, does believe in, well, then that is actually what the Court was doing. That is what they did. That is what the opinion says. When you read the opinion, Madam Speaker, it is just dripping with all of the things that you would expect it to be filled with in terms of deference to what occurred in 1965, what the Supreme Court said subsequent to that about why it was in a particularly important time for Congress to step over the role of the States because of the nature of the invidious discrimination in Jim Crow South and other areas of the country.

It wasn't just the South, by the way, there were counties all over the country.

But, Madam Speaker, when you looked at the data—and I pored over the data—we showed places there were counties in Florida that were covered, counties in Florida that weren't covered, and you could see that the voting rates of Black voters, Hispanic voters, and other voters, that vast numbers of people were turning out and showing up to vote, those numbers were even higher in some of the covered jurisdictions.

So you had no reason or basis to cover one county versus another in the State of Florida, Madam Speaker.

But I would challenge all of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to go open up those views, go look in and look at the data, look at the tables, and what you will find, Madam Speaker, is that there were significant numbers of counties and States that were then at that time covered by the Voting Rights Act that had better turnout rates and better participation rates than those that were uncovered which left the Court looking at the law and said: Well, hold on a second.

The whole reason that the Court upheld the law was because there was a unique circumstance where there were mass disparities because of very direct actions by those States.

I want the American people to know that because that is what is being said right now.

□ 2120

So suddenly, if I say: Hey, we might want voter ID.

Now, why might we want voter ID? Just to ensure that the one person who is voting in one person, one vote is actually the vote.

I say I want voter ID. Maybe that is because I have witnessed reasons why that is so. Somehow that is voter suppression?

That is what is so entirely frustrating is that you come forward and you say: Hey, I think that there is a good reason for this that, in my mind, I see very clearly as being important for the integrity of the election.

Let's not get wrapped around in the 2016 or 2020 election cycles. I have said a lot on the floor of the House at various times about those matters. Let's just actually focus on voter integrity, election integrity, and wanting to make sure that the people who vote know that their vote is going to count fully, and that you are not going to have someone voting with your ID.

We know for sure that there are individuals who come to the United States and use the identification of others, of Americans. We know that for sure. That is a fact.

We know that we end up with multiple people voting. We end up with all sorts of different possible and potential fraudulent activity.

For example, The New York Times, in 2012: "Yet, votes cast by mail are less likely to be counted, more likely to be compromised, and more likely to be contested than those cast in a voting booth." That is The New York Times, that bastion of rightwing conspiracy.

We know that the Carter-Baker Commission, Jimmy Carter, known rightwing conspirator from Georgia, and James Baker, again, not really known to be a rightwing activist, quote in their report, "Absentee ballots remain the largest source of potential voter fraud."

That is just data. It is just analyzing it. It is just fact.

Then, you go through other examples of known fraud.

Madam Speaker, 2016, at least 83 registered voters in San Pedro, California, received absentee ballots at the same small two-bedroom apartment.

In a 2018 North Carolina congressional race, a Republican operative, L. McCrae Dowless, Jr., had allegedly requested more than 1,200 absentee ballots on voters' behalf and then collected the ballots from voters' homes when they were mailed out. That was a Republican operative. I am an equal opportunity presenter of the facts here of how fraud can occur.

I can go through item after item. In 2017, an investigation of a Dallas City Council election found 700 fraudulent mail-in ballots signed by the same witness using a fake name.

There is other voter fraud in Texas. Since 2005, the Office of the Attorney General successfully prosecuted 534 incidents of fraud against 155 individuals, et cetera, et cetera.

I can go through county by county. In Medina County, Texas, four people, including an elected justice of the peace, were charged in February with 150 counts of election fraud. The charges included ballot harvesting and illegal voting. I can go example by example.

Now, were all of those examples I just gave enough to turn an election? I don't know. That is the point. We would like to know wherever that truth may lead, in whatever State and whatever county, wherever that takes us. But those are the facts.

So, when somebody comes forward and says, "Hey, I think we ought to have voter ID. I think we ought to have voter ID or a way to attach an individual to a mail-in ballot," suddenly that is voter suppression? Right.

So, suddenly, Major League Baseball walks in and says: I have an idea. Let's pull out the All-Star Game from Atlanta, Georgia, where we could celebrate Hank Aaron in a 50 percent Black city, and let's go move it over to Colorado, into Denver, which is a 10 percent Black city. And let's pat ourselves on the back for being so exceptionally in tune with what is going on in the world. Let's move the All-Star Game to Colorado.

Why? The laws that were put on the books in Georgia this year, that were being voted on in Georgia, would basically make parity with what Colorado already has on the books.

This is the kind of debate we want to be able to have. Can we just, like, all agree? Let's get a whiteboard up and put the facts up of what these things are, what the bills are, what these laws are, and then at least be debating from the same sheet of music.

I may have a few more things to say. I know I have some colleagues here. I want to be mindful of their time.

I digressed there a little bit because I was hearing my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. But election integrity is so critically important right now, and I have colleagues from Texas who are completely abandoning their duty—I should say State legislature colleagues, to be clear—who are abandoning their duty to represent their constituents in the State of Texas in the legislature and have a full-throated debate about S.B. 1 and H.B. 3, the current bills in the legislative session, the special session in Texas, and have come to D.C. They are not doing their jobs.

Look, man, I generally want to flee D.C. to go back to Texas. It is rare that I see people saying I want to flee Texas to come to D.C.

But these Democratic members of the Texas Legislature have fled Austin to skip out on working in the Texas legislative session and have an open debate. They are coming to D.C. to sit down with the Vice President to go

push and promote H.R. 1 or other bills to say we need to federalize elections instead of actually doing their job, which brings me to my point.

I will say a few things here, and then I will recognize my colleagues. At some point, we have to decide what it is that is actually sacred about what we are doing here as a Nation and as a body.

Our borders, right now, are wide open. Opioids are skyrocketing. Massive numbers cross the border. I will get into some of these details in a minute. We do it. I have done it before.

We have the schools that are teaching so-called antiracism.

I walked through the Austin airport today and saw the book by Ibram Kendi, the antiracism book. I can't remember the title. I saw it sitting there in the bookstore BookPeople. I didn't see a whole lot of conservative books in there, but I saw that book, sitting there in the front.

On page 19 of that book, he writes: "If racial discrimination is defined as treating, considering, or making a distinction in favor of or against an individual based on that person's race, then racial discrimination is not inherently racist. The defining question is whether the discrimination is creating equity or inequity. If discrimination is creating equity, then it is antiracist."

Interesting definition of discrimination. Not sure that fits within the Civil Rights Act, but I will leave that for another discussion.

But what I am saying is, we are heightening the level to which every single aspect of our lives is taken through a political lens, every single thing.

I am asking my staff to look at every hearing that this body has had since the beginning of January and tell me what percentage of the hearings has had a focus or something to do on race, on sexual orientation, or an issue in that type of framework. I guarantee you—I don't have to count them—that number is going to be massively high.

I will just go ahead and stipulate right now, without having done any counting, the percentage of hearings that this body has held, the percentage of hearings that focused on race, LGBTQ issues, sexual orientation, those issues will be extraordinarily high as a percentage.

So, the majority believes that is where our focus should be—while we just spent \$6 trillion, while inflation is running through the roof, while small businesses can't hire people. My colleagues on the other side of the aisle know this because, assuredly, they have small businesses in their district, or they go to the restaurants, or they go to the places like I have gone to and they can't hire people because we are paying people more not to work than to work.

We have a principal focus on race-related issues, a complete abandonment of the responsibility of this body to secure the border of the United States. It is wide open, opioids running amuck.

Cartels own it. People are pouring across it, to their detriment and ours. Ranchers are getting overrun in Texas.

Now, today, just yesterday, or, I don't know, the last few days, the Senate Armed Services Committee voted overwhelmingly to draft our daughters. Heck, we had 8 Republicans of the 13 vote for that nonsense, to draft our daughters.

Who are we? Genuine question: Who are we, as a people, as a country? Where are the sacred boundaries of being able to decide how to live and to recognize truths that man is man, that woman is woman, and that I, as a father, do not want to have my daughter get drafted?

You say, well, you can draft your son, use the power of the government to draft your son.

We can have a debate about ending the draft. Everyone comes back and says: Well, don't worry. There is not going to be a draft. There hasn't been a draft in 50 years, so don't worry about it.

□ 2130

What do you mean don't worry about it? When my daughter turns 18 in 8 years and she has to go sign a piece of paper to register, I shouldn't be worried about my daughter getting drafted and getting sent to a foxhole in Afghanistan or Iraq or somewhere else? What do you mean don't worry about that?

Yet, that is precisely what this body is doing. The Senate Armed Services Committee voted on it; the House already has that language.

Let me be perfectly clear. I will not be honoring whatever law says it is drafting my daughter. That is the fundamental problem. The rule of law depends on it being rooted in any basic understanding of who we are as a people, where we come from, what our values are, and then actually being able to get the consent of the governed in a way that actually connects with the governed.

It doesn't just come on down from on high, from a Senate Armed Services Committee that votes, by the way, behind closed doors, not in public viewing. And by the way, none of them will go out and enforce this garbage. But somebody one day will show up and hand a form to my daughter and say, "I am sorry, ma'am, you are going to have to register for the draft." And I am going to be sitting there as a dad—and I promise you, my wife is a little more fired up about this than I am. My wife is going to be sitting there saying: "Over my dead, dang body."

Now, this is what we do when we rip apart our society, when we forget where those sacred boundaries are, about what the role of this institution is, or how we are supposed to govern.

I am going to pause for a few moments. I think both of my colleagues who are here wanting to speak to the issues that we are seeing unfold in Cuba, maybe a few other matters of im-

portance to them. I certainly appreciate their time. I think they share some of the sentiments that I am sharing.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for having the Special Order on freedom, on liberty, on constitutionalism, and our God-given rights.

Thank you for what you have said there, Mr. ROY.

Madam Speaker, I am here tonight to highlight and amplify the miraculous events that have happened less than 100 miles from U.S. soil on the island of Cuba, news that, sadly, we haven't heard nearly enough about.

After more than 60 years of oppression, injustice, and fear under a Communist Party that enjoys opulent privileges while others struggle just to survive, Cubans took to the streets shouting: "Liberty" and "Down with communism."

And this wasn't just in Havana and the big cities. Renewed calls for freedom were all across small villages and towns in the Cuban countryside.

These brave protestors, many of them young people, knew their appeals would be met with violence. They understood that they would be putting themselves and their families at grave risk. They knew they would be labeled enemies of the state, enemies of the revolution, and they would be arrested or potentially even murdered.

Today, I would like to let each of my liberty-loving Cuban brothers and sisters out there know that we hear you. I commend your astounding courage, your thirst for freedom, and your desire for true justice in Cuba.

We, as Americans, have a moral responsibility to support these protests of Cuba's cruel Communist regime.

How can we continue to be "the shining city upon a hill," as President Reagan once eloquently said, if we do not help those who are seeking the same divine right that our ancestors fought and died for in the Revolution, the same rights that our Heavenly Father intended for all people?

I think it is time for the reign of dictatorship and terror to come to an end and for freedom and for liberty to take their rightful place.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my friend, for his words, and I am going to yield to the gentleman from California here in just a moment.

I would ask one question to the gentleman from Texas, and I will repeat that question to my friend from California.

I share your enthusiasm and commitment for wanting to help the people of Cuba who are seeking freedom and obviously have been living under the thumb of tyranny for far too long.

I was chief of staff to Senator TED CRUZ. His father is a dear friend, and he knew all too well what life was like under that murderous regime.

Our friend and our colleague, Alex Mooney, his wonderful mother, similarly, at the same rough timeframe, was subjected to the horrors of Cuba in that time in the late fifties, early sixties, and then came to the United States.

But I would ask my friend, that as we watch these individuals from Cuba seeking freedom—and God bless them; we need to support them—and/or seeking to come to the United States seeking freedom, do you believe that our country is itself upholding and adhering to the ideals that they are seeking?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I cannot answer in the affirmative. I think our country is under grave attack, our liberties, our freedoms, our constitutional rights, the Bill of Rights, the very reasons that Samuel Adams and Dr. Joseph Warren, and all of those Founders, like John Hancock, who started the movement that culminated in the Revolutionary War and got us out from under the yoke of Great Britain.

I will say this: I think what we are seeing today is, quite frankly, a startling, unbelievable change of events that I never thought that I would see in my entire lifetime, the assault on our God-given rights that we are seeing today.

What Mr. ROY just said about drafting our daughters and what he just mentioned and listening to our friends across the aisle over there talking about the unfairness and the racism that is incumbent and inherently in our election processes, their solution would be an absolute violation of the U.S. Constitution.

I think it goes without saying that if you have to show an I.D. to get into the White House or to get a loan or to do anything, really, of any kind of nature as far as that is concerned, that we have to have the ability to ask for a photo I.D. to ascertain whether you are, indeed, that person that you are actually professing to be when you come in and cast that vote.

So we hear a lot of talk. But I will tell you, it is just talk. When you talk about freedom and liberties, we have to follow the Constitution and God's law. That is what it has to be.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas. I will yield to my friend in California in a moment.

I couldn't agree more with respect to the current situation we find ourselves and our country in. A country where we are now talking about vaccine passports, where we are talking about diving into the private affairs of American citizens in the alleged name of health and welfare of the people, we are forgetting that fundamental, core liberty of being free from government coercion.

When you go look at the Constitution and when we talk about the President of the United States talking about going door to door—and I know it

might have been a rhetorical statement, but you never really know. But when the Constitution contemplates going door to door, it does so only in a couple of contexts: the Census, and then protecting individuals against it, by, in the Third Amendment, preventing the quartering of troops in the homes of American people; by preventing, through the Fourth Amendment, unreasonable search and seizure.

That is what was on the minds of the Founders. That was why the Constitution was structured the way it was structured. It wasn't to empower government in the name of something supposedly greater, in the "common good." How many hundreds of millions of people in this world have been slaughtered in the name of the common good? How many?

□ 2140

Let's ask the people of Cuba. Let's ask the people of Cuba, seeking freedom, seeking to either come to the United States or have the kind of freedom that they believe exists in the United States, and have that in Cuba, whether we should be empowering government, supposedly in the name of the good or the common good of the people.

Our Constitution exists to protect and preserve liberty. That is what it exists for. That is what this country was founded upon; a belief in the Almighty and a belief in liberty. And we are tearing that apart by the thread. Every single day we are tearing that apart by the thread.

Even as people today right now want to have a business, be able to employ people. They can't, because they are told by some bright-eyed leftist: Don't worry, just pay them more money. Without any concept of what that does to a bottom line. Without any concept what that does to an income statement, being able to actually raise money, risk capital, put their name on the line, borrow, and then hire people to engage in the business of their dream.

Maybe they inherited it from their family, their parents, their great-grandparents. What do we do? We just say: Don't worry about it, pay them \$15 an hour. Like there is some magic fairy dust that tells people what the wage ought to be.

We destroy businesses in the name of being nice to people. You know what it does? It limits the numbers of jobs, drives up the prices of goods, causes people not to have jobs, causes people not to be able to get the job, and then be able to afford whatever it is they want to buy. All because somebody said, Oh, gee, I have got a magic number, \$15 an hour.

Why not \$20? Why not \$50? I mean, if we are going to be all generous, hell, just make it \$1,000 an hour. Oh, no, CHIP, that is just crazy talk.

Child tax credits, why stop at \$300? Modern monetary theory, just spend whatever you want to. Why not make it \$30,000? Man, then everybody would be doing great.

My colleagues don't ever want to actually sit down and actually put pen to paper and figure out what in the heck can we actually afford as a country and what are we doing to the dignity of work? What are we doing to the American family? And what are we doing to freedom and the ability of the individual to prosper according to his or her hard work and according to what he or she wants to accomplish in their faith and what they want to put in, the toil they want to put in their life?

We are ripping that apart. We are ripping it apart in the name of compassion. Just like we are ripping apart the lives of migrants in the name of compassion, who are getting absolutely decimated by cartels. We do it and we say: Oh, look at us, how nice we are; when the little 7-year-old girl is sold into the sex trafficking trade because we put them in the hands of violent cartels along the border of Texas.

Does anybody care about the numbers? Does anybody look at what is actually happening down at the border? I know, there he goes again, there goes that crazy CHIP ROY talking about the border again. Talk to my constituents. Talk to the people of Texas, who are getting absolutely crushed.

The numbers are astounding. We are not just talking about people and the problems that we are having with ranchers, and we are talking about the sex and human trafficking trade.

Right here we see the encounters by month. We have never seen anything like this. When Jeh Johnson headed up the Department of Homeland Security under President Obama, he said a thousand a month was a crisis. I was just looking at the numbers. We had a few thousand in a day just last week in the McAllen sector. We had 20,000 a week. We had a few thousand in a day in the Laredo sector, a few thousand a day in the McAllen sector.

We have had, I think—this is from memory—70 Border Patrol agents get COVID in the last month. We had 20 in Laredo.

All of this is happening in real time. All while the administration talks about unwinding title 42 and not worrying about what is happening at our southern border while telling us and preaching to us about vaccine passports. Oh, no, you better go mask up again.

Fentanyl. Right down here, fentanyl, 2021 versus 2020 fentanyl numbers. We are bringing in a thousand pounds of fentanyl in a month. A thousand pounds of fentanyl in a month. That is enough to kill millions of people. But that is happening right now. Nobody seems to care on the other side of the aisle. They say: Oh, don't worry, it is just fentanyl. No problem to see here.

Would you say that to my constituent who died with a valium laced with fentanyl recently? This is happening across the country. We are now at 92,000 or so opioid deaths in this country. I will come back to that in a minute, because I want to yield to my

friend from California. But that is what we are facing.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I appreciate both my colleagues from Texas and the spirited debate here.

You know, I hadn't intended to talk about the draft there, but Mr. ROY was bringing that up very vigorously. I have to agree 100 percent that our volunteer military has worked pretty well for us for approximately, I think, 40 years.

What is it that would have anybody even institute the idea of draft for men or women, incredibly, at this point? Is it because our numbers are down? Is it because we are not getting the people in or is it somehow some kind of equity?

I am not sure what the mind set is, but if you want to inspire people to be part of our military, why don't you make it inspiring instead of a bastion of political correctness and the woke racism conversations happening everywhere else where even a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is bringing it up and bringing this literature out that is supposed to make people feel bad about serving as brothers in arms in the military, you know, because of their race.

If you want to inspire people, don't make them feel bad about joining. Therefore, you don't even have to talk about draft, because you could get folks who want an opportunity, whether it is their dedication to completely serving their country or they see some opportunities there with the education that can be offered through the program with the military. Whatever the combination is, you inspire people to be part of it, just as if you are selling a product anywhere else in the free market in this country.

Why in the world would we do this political correctness, this continued race conversation that is driving people away? I don't understand.

Mr. ROY. Would the gentleman yield for just one second?

Mr. LAMALFA. Sure.

Mr. ROY. Would it surprise the gentleman to learn that I share his concern about the state of the United States military, given the politically correct nature of the current leadership?

I just met with a bunch of parents of the individuals that I have nominated to go to the academies, and these parents are beside themselves. They are saying, please, can you stop this? It is going to endanger my kids who are going to go serve their country at the academies because they hear the facts. They see that the U.S. Special Forces hired their first chief diversity officer; that the Department of Defense just hired a chief diversity officer; that a Space Force guardian was fired for saying the "diversity, inclusion, and equity industry and the trainings we're receiving in the military via that industry are rooted in critical race theory which is rooted in Marxism."

This isn't just embarrassing and un-American. It is making us weak. Our diplomats are apologizing to the Chinese Communist Party for racism when Beijing is running concentration camps. This is the reality of what we are doing to our military, where we are running ads talking about LGBTQ issues instead of actually just recruiting warriors to go defend the United States of America. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAMALFA. It is a pretty clear defined mission what our military is supposed to be doing in protecting our shores. We have certainly strayed very far from that. As I mentioned, it is not inspiring the best, the brightest, the toughest to come in.

I have had some of these conversations with the parents and some of the people already in the military here. A young man just the other day, during the 4th of July, of all things, I said, "What do you think of what is going on?" This young man is very, very gravely concerned, because by far there are a lot of great, great young people there. They are standing up for their flag, for their country, and they are wondering what is going on with their leadership.

Indeed, if we want to be at the point of the type of readiness that is even more acute than ever right now in this world with China, China is just waiting. China is probably over there laughing at us right now with what is going on with this administration and the priorities for our military. Russia is poised to continue to do more aggression in their zones over there. And let alone an unstable place like Iran and even North Korea. What is it they can do or be capable of doing? Now with this pullout in Afghanistan, what are we unleashing there?

We have got to return to a common-sense approach that goes back to what the true military role and duty and mission is, and we are drifting far from it.

□ 2150

What I wanted to pick up on, too, as far as when we were talking about our border, immigration, in general, and this recent topic of with Cuba.

What do we learn from 60-plus years of oppression under Castro and those who followed? Maybe everything wasn't beautiful under Batista back in 1959 or what have you, but they certainly, when they had that revolution then, I don't think the regular, normal, good people of Cuba bargained for what they have had at all for the last 60 years.

The way this administration is handling it is almost basically ignoring it. Look at the people in Cuba who are holding our flag, not unlike in Hong Kong. It is very interesting. The question the gentleman posed to my colleague, maybe he wants to pose it again here, but when we are going in the direction of where Cuba is, where the Communist Chinese Party is going,

we are holding up pictures of Che Guevara. Even in this Chamber we hear the type of sympathy towards the Castro era. It is unbelievable to me how this has been allowed to happen.

Well, part of it, I guess, is the American public isn't paying enough attention. You need to demand more or demand better of who you are electing and compare this, contrast it with what hasn't worked around the world under communism for many decades.

So with Cuba, you have a situation where this administration is ignoring those who are seeking asylum from a Communist regime for years and years. We have a lot of good Cuban people who have come to this country years ago—they even trickle in now—colleagues that Mr. ROY had mentioned here that some were in this Chamber of Cuban descent. They love this country and see the opportunity here. That is why they cobble together these boats and rafts. I would like to say they are made basically made out of milk cartons. They coming toward us.

We don't see these people complaining about this country and its flag and desecrating its flag cobbling together milk carton rafts and going toward Cuba for their amazing healthcare system and their amazing education system that we hear people on other side of the aisle claiming to be the way to go. So what is it?

What is asylum? When we are granting it to people coming up illegally from Central America, they are not seeking the true definition of asylum, they are seeking economic opportunity. Do I blame them? No. They live in bad conditions down there, but they also see this giant green light at our border saying: Come on across. Even though the laws on the books say "no" and we have people hired to patrol the border. Instead, they are being focused more and directed more to be a welcome wagon at the border. What are we doing?

Asylum is defined: "The protection granted by a nation to someone who has left their native country as a political refugee."

The people who have been trying to and some successfully escaping Cuba for 60 years are the perfect definition of that. Those are the ones we should be looking at, and this administration should be looking at finding a way to help them.

Those in Central America who are coming here for jobs, we have legislation to work in that direction to have a legal workforce come here, or those who are already here illegally, find a way to get to legal status under our rules, under our laws.

But, no, this administration is leaving our border wide open, as was mentioned. The fentanyl, thousands of pounds, how far would that go? And where is it landing? The stuff we do catch is significant, but the stuff that we are not catching up with at the border, where is it going? Where is it being stockpiled? When is that going to come

out? That is extremely dangerous. Extremely.

I like to think that these freedom fighters, whether it is Hong Kong or other places who are using our flag as a symbol of freedom and hope, and the one they want to emulate and get to, whether it is in their country or maybe even come here, and we are going in the other direction. It is unbelievable to me when we can't even have our Olympians respect our flag; we can't have our soccer team; when we can't have basically the singing of the National Anthem or the recitation of our flag salute in our schools.

One of the young men I talk about, now in the military, I am really proud of that young man. I don't have authorization to say his name. His first name is Grayson. What a great kid. He is going to be a real doer in our military. He fought to just have his flag salute done at his high school. It hadn't been done in 40 years, and he had to overcome a bureaucracy that said: Oh, we don't know. It might offend somebody. Oh, we haven't asked all of the teachers. We haven't asked all of the school board.

This young man took it upon himself to petition his fellow students to get this done. And I said: If they don't get it done, I will be right there with you at 8:30 in the morning. We will do it right in the front of the school. Well, they got it done. And I am so proud of him and what he is going to do. But there are many, many Americans like that all over this world, serving across the world, living here in this country that believe in that as well and take that pledge.

Spontaneously, at the baseball game, if they are not going to do the National Anthem, they spontaneously start it themselves. It is pretty amazing. At the NHL hockey playoff game in New York, those Islander fans stood up and joined in with one that was going on, and the singer, she actually stood down so she could feel that moment. Pretty amazing. This still exists in the hearts and minds of most Americans in this country.

We will not allow ourselves to be beaten down by political correctness, critical race theory, and all of these other things that aren't really who we are or what is in the hearts of the vast majority of the people of this country.

When we are talking about our border, it is a sieve, which is a giant problem. It wasn't a problem nearly as much under President Trump, who was trying to solve the issue, but also work with those countries and help solve the issue within. Instead, it was just open season on all of us, on our taxpayers, our schools, our healthcare system, and even all of the COVID business that has been manipulated to a degree that Americans really need to question how much longer they are going to have their freedoms, as was mentioned by Mr. ROY: vaccine passports being forced upon us.

In California, they are talking about you can't work in the State as a State

employee unless you get the vaccine, or perhaps you can get off the hook by getting a test every single week.

Where are our liberties? If you are not concerned about our liberties and our basic freedom, you better wake up right now because you don't get them back once they have been taken. It is much more difficult to get them back than what our Founders had laid down and all of those buried in Arlington—as I drove by in town today—fought to preserve.

We have a job as Americans. I wear this tie and suit. I leave my farm every week to be a part of it, too, because we can't just sit still anymore. We all have to be part of this.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his words, and I appreciate the passion and the commitment to what the gentleman just shared with not just me and with my friend from Texas, but with the American people.

I ask the Speaker how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. ROY. Madam Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues for coming down and joining me. I would only add this: As we sit here and we hear so much negativity about what is going on, the virus, for example, and vaccines, we hear nothing from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but everybody is stonewalling and so forth. We have administered 188 million individuals with the vaccine in this country; 340 or so million doses. About 57 percent of the total population, about 80 percent of those over 65 have had two shots, 90 percent have had one shot.

We are well above the vast majority of the world in terms of total numbers. As a percentage, we are a little bit behind, because we are a large country. When you look at what we have actually accomplished—remember, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who last year were saying: This vaccine stuff, that is all fool's gold.

We know that is true. We know that is what our Vice President said, and a lot of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle said: Don't touch the vaccine. That is crazy stuff. Well, now, all of a sudden it is like: You better go get the vaccine. Run and get the vaccine. You have to get the vaccine. Get the vaccine.

Okay, I am telling my dad, a polio survivor, 78-years old: Go get the vaccine, dad. But what if you have natural immunity? Should you go get the vaccine? What if you are a kid? Should you go get the vaccine? Those are questions, and they are reasonable questions.

This government, in its infinite wisdom, shut down businesses, shut down schools, mandated masks, created all sorts of mental health issues, prohibited people from going to get cancer screenings and take care of themselves and their families, forced elderly cou-

ples who have been married for 40 or 50 years not to be able to say good-bye when one of them was passing away, all in the name of the government taking care of us.

In the infinite wisdom of the government I should just go run down and say: Oh, sure, let me run down and get the vaccine when how much money has been given to the pharmaceutical companies? How many billions of dollars are they getting, and how much do they get for the boosters?

By the way, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle were going after the profitability of the pharmaceutical companies at an oversight hearing that I was in last year, 2 years ago.

The bottom line here is: This country is a great country filled with great people, doing great things, every single day, and when this body and this government gets out of the way of the American people, they continue to do great things. The greatness and the future of our country lies with them and with the people.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 27, 2021, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 978, Chai Suthammanont Remembrance Act of 2021, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 1664, a bill to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 2365, the Gold Star Mothers Family Monument Extension Act, as amended, would have

no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 2485, the Access to Congressionally Mandated Reports Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 2617, the Performance Enhancement Reform Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 3599, the Federal Rotational Cyber Workforce Program Act of 2021, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that H.R. 4300, the Alexander Lofgren Veterans in Parks (VIP) Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-1683. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Lewis A. Craparotta, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1684. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John M. Jansen, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1685. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting an additional legislative proposal that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 117th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1686. A letter from the Acting First Vice President and Vice Chairman, Export-

Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a statement with respect to a transaction involving exports to Canada, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3); July 31, 1945, ch. 341, Sec. 2 (as added by Public Law 102-266, Sec. 102); (106 Stat. 95); to the Committee on Financial Services.

EC-1687. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final requirements — American Rescue Plan Act Homeless Children and Youth Program (RIN: 1801-AA24) received July 21, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-1688. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final requirements — American Rescue Plan Act Emergency Assistance to Non-Public Schools Program (RIN: 1810-AB63) received July 21, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

EC-1689. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting that, as a result of continued consequences of the opioid crisis, a renewal, effective July 7, 2021, that a public health emergency exists and has existed since October 26, 2017, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1690. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the 2020 Report to Congress Substance Use-Disorder Prevention that Promotes Opioid Recovery and Treatment (SUP-PORT) for Patients and Communities Act, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 823(g)(2)(G)(iv); Public Law 115-271, Sec. 3201(e); (132 Stat. 3944); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1691. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting as a result of continued consequences of Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) pandemic, a renewal, effective April 15, 2021, that a public health emergency exists and has existed since January 27, 2020, nationwide, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1692. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Food Additives Permitted in Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Selenomethionine Hydroxy Analogue [Docket No.: FDA-2020-F-1289] received July 21, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1693. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Tobacco Products; Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements; Delayed Effective Date [Docket No.: FDA-2019-N-3065] (RIN: 0910-AI39) received July 21, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1694. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress on the State Pilot Grant Program for Treatment for Pregnant and Postpartum Women, established under the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act (CARA) of 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1695. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting the 2020 Garrett Lee Smith Youth Suicide Prevention and Early Intervention Program National Outcomes Evaluation Report to Congress, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 290bb-36b(f); Public Law 108-355, Sec. 3(d); (118 Stat. 1415); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1696. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Public Health Data System Modernization Strategy and Implementation Plan for Fiscal Year 2020; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1697. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0145; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-01212-R; Amendment 39-21558; AD 2021-10-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1698. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluxapyroxad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2020-0228; FRL-8663-01-OCSP] received July 21, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1699. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Alkoxylated C8-C18 Saturated and Unsaturated Alcohol and Adipic Acid (AASUAA); Exemption From the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2021-0197; FRL-8581-01-OCSP] received July 21, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1700. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Implementation of the Revoked 1997 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Areas that Attained by the Attainment Date [EPA-HQ-OAR-2019-0611; FRL10024-17-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AU54) received July 20, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1701. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Monitoring Requirements [EPA-HQ-OPA-2006-0090; FRL-10025-88-OLEM] (RIN: 2050-AH16) received July 20, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1702. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's issuance of regulatory guidance — Volcanic Hazards Assessment for Proposed Nuclear Power Reactor Sites [Regulatory Guide 4.26, Revision 0] received July 2, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1703. A letter from the Executive Director, Southeast Compact Commission for Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management, transmitting the 2018-2019 and the 2019-2020 Annual Reports of the Southeast Interstate Low-Level Radioactive Waste Commission that include the Annual Commission Audits; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-1704. A letter from the Senior Advisor, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services,

transmitting a notification of an action on nomination and a discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, Sec. 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-1705. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress from the Office of Inspector General, for the period October 1, 2020, through March 31, 2021; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-1706. A letter from the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin, transmitting the Commission's audited Eightieth Financial Statement for the period of October 1, 2019 to September 30, 2020; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

EC-1707. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting notification of the online release of the four most recent reports summarizing the activities of the International Terrorism Victim Expense Reimbursement Program, pursuant to 34 U.S.C. 20106(c); Public Law 98-473, Sec. 1404C(c) (as added by Public Law 106-386, Sec. 2003(c)(1)); (114 Stat. 1545); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1708. A letter from the Deputy Clerk, Office of the Clerk, Fifth Circuit, United States Court of Appeals, transmitting an opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit concerning No. 20-60353, Guerrero Trejo v. Garland, BIA No. A205 288 147; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-1709. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0191; Project Identifier AD-2020-01492-E; Amendment 39-21633; AD 2021-14-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 16, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1710. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (AHD) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0126; Project Identifier MCAI-2020-00266-R; Amendment 39-21556; AD 2021-10-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1711. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pilot Records Database [Docket No.: FAA-2020-0246; Amdt. Nos. 11-65, 91-363, and 111-1] (RIN: 2120-AK31) received June 30, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1712. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2021-0378; Project Identifier 2017-SW-122-AD; Amendment 39-21576; AD 2021-11-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received June 30, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1713. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's 2020 Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 1116(c); Public Law 103-272, Sec. 1(d) (as amended by Public Law 115-254, Sec. 1107(a)); (132 Stat. 3432);

to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

EC-1714. A letter from the Regulations Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of General Counsel (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Loan Guaranty: COVID-19 Veterans Assistance Partial Claim Payment Program (RIN: 2900-AR05) received June 30, 2021, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-1715. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the FY 2017 Annual Report to the Congress on the Child Support Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 652(a)(10); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title IV, Sec. 452 (as amended by Public Law 93-647, Sec. 101(a)); (88 Stat. 2352); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 438. A bill to amend the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act to extend the deadline for a report by the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-103). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1154. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study to assess the suitability and feasibility of designating certain land as the Great Dismal Swamp National Heritage Area, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-104). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 4300. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make free National Parks and Federal Recreational Lands Passes available to members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with amendments (Rept. 117-105, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1029. A bill to Waive the application fee for any special use permit for veterans' special events at war memorials on land administered by the National Park Service in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-106). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GRIJALVA: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1664. A bill to authorize the National Medal of Honor Museum Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes (Rept. 117-107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEUTCH: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Allegations Relating to Representative Joyce Beatty (Rept. 117-108). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MCGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 555. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4502) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; and for other purposes (Rept. 117-109). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 4300 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4679. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 1200 New Jersey Avenue Southeast in Washington, DC, as the "Norman Yoshio Mineta Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. DANNY

K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SWALWELL, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KIND, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LATTI, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. BANKS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOHMERT, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. JOYCE of Pennsylvania, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. BIGGS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. SCHNEIDER):

H.R. 4680. A bill to form the Federal sugar program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4681. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to establish a new class of nonimmigrant visas for entrepreneurs and essential employees affiliated with start-up entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUEST (for himself, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. KATKO):

H.R. 4682. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security from operating or procuring certain foreign-made unmanned aircraft systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 4683. A bill to establish a process for the testing and evaluation of the Electronic Health Record Modernization Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs by the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROOKS (for himself, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. MOORE of Alabama):

H.R. 4684. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to revise regulations to ensure a Department of Defense civilian pilot is eligible for certain ratings in the same manner as a military pilot, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CASTEN (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 4685. A bill to require the Government Accountability Office to carry out a study on the impact of the gamification, psychological nudges, and other design techniques used by online trading platforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHABOT (for himself, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. TAYLOR):

H.R. 4686. A bill to promote free and fair elections, political freedoms, and human rights in Cambodia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 4687. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the establishment of supermarkets in certain underserved areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONNOLLY (for himself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4688. A bill to require the collection of voluntary feedback on services provided by agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. DUNN (for himself, Mr. LAWSON

of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WALTZ, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. POSEY, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. DONALDS, Mr. GIMENEZ, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. STEUBE, and Mrs. CAMMACK):

H.R. 4689. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Bobby Bowden, in honor of his achievements both on and off the football field; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. HUFFMAN (for himself and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 4690. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. GARBARINO, and Mr. CLYDE):

H.R. 4691. A bill to establish a K-12 education cybersecurity initiative, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4692. A bill to require the testing of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances under the Toxic Substances Control Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. KIM of California, and Ms. HOULAHAN):

H.R. 4693. A bill to advance targeted and evidence-based interventions for the prevention and treatment of global malnutrition and to improve the coordination of such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. DELAUNO, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 4694. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish the Office of Food Safety Reassessment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. SAN NICOLAS):

H.R. 4695. A bill to require all newly constructed, federally assisted, single-family houses and town houses to meet minimum

standards of visitability for persons with disabilities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. WALTZ (for himself, Mr. BUCHANAN, Ms. MACE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. GIMENEZ, Mr. MAST, Mr. POSEY, Mr. DUNN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DONALDS, Ms. SALAZAR, Mrs. CAMMACK, and Mr. STEUBE):

H.R. 4696. A bill to amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 to extend the moratorium on drilling off the coasts of the States of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. KAHELE, and Mr. CASE):

H.R. 4697. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to eliminate certain requirements relating to the award of construction subcontracts within the county or State of performance; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. LANDEVIN, and Mr. YOUNG):

H. Res. 552. A resolution recognizing the importance of independent living for individuals with disabilities made possible by the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and calling for further action to strengthen home and community living for individuals with disabilities; to the Committee on Education and Labor, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, the Judiciary, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BURGESS (for himself, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. KATKO):

H. Res. 553. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Homeland Security to transmit, respectively, certain documents to the House of Representatives relating to unaccompanied alien children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. Res. 554. A resolution raising a question of the privileges of the House.

By Mr. BIGGS:

H. Res. 556. A resolution recognizing the importance of access to comprehensive, high-quality, life-affirming medical care for women of all ages; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAWTHORN (for himself, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio):

H. Res. 557. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives against the malignant and metastasizing ideology of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. MANNING, Mr. MEIJER, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. LIEU, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. HILL):

H. Res. 558. A resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ISSA (for himself, Mr. CASE, Ms. HERRELL, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SALAZAR, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. GARCIA of

California, Mr. NUNES, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. STEEL, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MCCARTHY, and Mr. OBERNOLTE):

H. Res. 559. A resolution expressing the Nation's sincerest appreciation for the service of the World War II Filipino veterans who fought in the Armed Forces on the 80th anniversary of President Franklin D. Roosevelt's military order; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin (for herself, Mr. TIFFANY, Mr. STEIL, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. KIND, Mr. GALLAGHER, and Mr. POCAN):

H. Res. 560. A resolution congratulating the Milwaukee Bucks, and the fans of the Milwaukee Bucks around the world, on winning the 2021 National Basketball Association championship; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. LONG, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H. Res. 561. A resolution recognizing and celebrating the 200th anniversary of the entry of Missouri, the "Show Me State", into the Union as the 24th State; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mrs. STEEL:

H. Res. 562. A resolution supporting the designation of August 24, 2021, as "Kobe Bryant Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

ML-58. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 96, to memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to support Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ML-59. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 103, urging efforts at state and federal levels to protect minority communities through better regulation of debt settlement companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4679.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 4680.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have

Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4681.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Mr. GUEST:

H.R. 4682.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 4683.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 4684.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. CASTEN:

H.R. 4685.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 4686.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4687.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. CONNOLLY:

H.R. 4688.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUNN:

H.R. 4689.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution

By Mr. HUFFMAN:

H.R. 4690.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4691.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 4692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 4693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18.

The Congress shall have Power . . .

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WALTZ:

H.R. 4696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 4697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 72: Mr. PENCE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 82: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CLOUD, and Mr. BERA.

H.R. 151: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 176: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 287: Mr. BIGGS.

H.R. 393: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 413: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 471: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 475: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 556: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 637: Mr. KATKO and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 654: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.

H.R. 746: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 890: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 903: Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. NEAL, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 959: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. PASCRELL, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 973: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1012: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 1029: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 1057: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Mr. CROW.

H.R. 1155: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 1177: Mr. KHANNA, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 1179: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. HIMES, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1283: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. LAMB, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 1297: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin and Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 1302: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1304: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1306: Ms. SHERRILL.

H.R. 1321: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BASS, Mr. SIMPSON, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1385: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1504: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 1551: Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 1561: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 1581: Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. HORSFORD, and Mr. BUTTERFIELD.

H.R. 1592: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 1655: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1667: Mr. HARDER of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 1696: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. NEGUSE.

H.R. 1734: Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 1783: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1819: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1842: Mr. HARRIS, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. RYAN, and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 1946: Mr. SOTO and Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 1959: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. MENG.

H.R. 2021: Ms. WATERS and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 2035: Mr. THOMPSON of California.

H.R. 2079: Mr. FEENSTRA.

H.R. 2104: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2113: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 2119: Ms. SHERRILL, Ms. WILD, Mr. LIEU, Ms. BUSH, and Ms. SCHRIER.

H.R. 2145: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 2166: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2169: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 2222: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2226: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2234: Mr. DOGGETT and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 2249: Ms. ROSS, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 2256: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. KIND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 2274: Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 2328: Mr. TRONE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 2339: Mr. KATKO and Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2364: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 2365: Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 2373: Mr. TRONE.

H.R. 2424: Mr. KIND, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. MANN.

H.R. 2454: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 2455: Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 2461: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 2499: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. NORCROSS, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 2503: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2517: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2586: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 2639: Mr. C. SCOTT FRANKLIN of Florida.

H.R. 2705: Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2724: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 2735: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 2759: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 2773: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. KAHELE.

H.R. 2811: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CROW, and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 2840: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2858: Mr. STANTON.

H.R. 2872: Ms. KUSTER and Ms. BROWNLEY.

H.R. 2924: Mr. CARSON, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. NEWMAN, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2936: Mr. RUIZ and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2946: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 3001: Mr. TRONE, Mr. KHANNA, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3031: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3042: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 3087: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3095: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. DELAULO.

H.R. 3100: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3115: Ms. JACOBS of California.

H.R. 3148: Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 3164: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 3187: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3190: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 3222: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3235: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. OBERNOLTE.

H.R. 3259: Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. CAMMACK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. MORELLE, Ms. DEAN, Mrs. MILLER of West Virginia, and Mr. BACON.

H.R. 3302: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

H.R. 3303: Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 3332: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3333: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 3367: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3435: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. LONG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DUNN, Mrs. LESKO, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 3440: Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 3441: Mr. MORELLE, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. TORRES of New York, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3446: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.

H.R. 3474: Mr. TORRES of New York.

H.R. 3480: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GARCÍA of Texas, Ms. MENG, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. JACOBS of California, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. HAYES, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. ROSS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. AUCHINCLOSS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. SEWELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. BASS, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. FLETCHER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SWALWELL, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. NEGUSE, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KIM of New Jersey, Mr. CARSON, Ms. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 3492: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3494: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.

H.R. 3508: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 3517: Mr. DELGADO, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 3537: Mr. GOODEN of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. MOONEY.

H.R. 3548: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3555: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 3580: Mr. SIREs, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. EVANS,

Mr. TRONE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3588: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 3602: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 3662: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 3667: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 3674: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3689: Ms. NEWMAN.

H.R. 3709: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN.

H.R. 3728: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 3744: Ms. WATERS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. BOWMAN.

H.R. 3780: Ms. WATERS, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3796: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3808: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3811: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. COLE.

H.R. 3824: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 3858: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3860: Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3876: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 3933: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3959: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 3965: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 3966: Mr. FALLON.

H.R. 3992: Ms. NEWMAN and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 4005: Mrs. TRAHAN.

H.R. 4010: Mr. SUOZZI.

H.R. 4017: Mr. SIREs.

H.R. 4024: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 4042: Ms. BROWNLEY, Ms. TITUS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. BARRAGÁN, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 4057: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 4066: Mr. GRIFFITH.

- H.R. 4068: Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 4071: Mr. FALLON and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4075: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 4096: Ms. LETLOW.
H.R. 4118: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 4123: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 4131: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOMEZ, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 4133: Mr. KINZINGER, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas, and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 4150: Mr. PFLUGER.
H.R. 4151: Ms. OMAR, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4181: Mr. FALLON.
H.R. 4186: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4190: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mr. MEIJER.
H.R. 4196: Mr. JACOBS of New York, Mr. FALLON, and Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
H.R. 4210: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. CARL.
H.R. 4217: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4230: Ms. MANNING.
H.R. 4250: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mrs. WAGNER.
H.R. 4268: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. KIM of New Jersey.
H.R. 4300: Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia.
H.R. 4311: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 4312: Mr. BROOKS.
H.R. 4315: Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 4328: Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 4331: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 4363: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 4375: Mr. LAMB, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 4379: Ms. SCANLON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CASE, Mr. CUELLAR, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 4382: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 4406: Mr. RUIZ, Mr. Cárdenas, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 4416: Mr. GARCIA of California.
H.R. 4421: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 4429: Mrs. HINSON.
H.R. 4440: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 4449: Mrs. RADEWAGEN.
H.R. 4459: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 4470: Mr. COMER.
H.R. 4488: Ms. PORTER.
H.R. 4498: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. ARMSTRONG, and Mr. HUIZENGA.
H.R. 4516: Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. BOEBERT, and Mr. BIGGS.
H.R. 4517: Mr. CARL, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. FITZGERALD.
H.R. 4526: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 4561: Mr. CHABOT and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 4568: Mrs. KIM of California, Mr. POSEY, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. HAGEDORN, and Mr. MANN.
H.R. 4573: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
H.R. 4589: Mr. BEYER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 4593: Mr. BARR, Mr. FITZGERALD, Mr. STEUBE, Mrs. BOEBERT, Ms. HERRELL, and Mr. PALAZZO.
H.R. 4595: Ms. JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.
H.R. 4596: Mr. SAN NICOLAS and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 4606: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4607: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 4609: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4615: Mr. VAN DREW and Mr. SUOZZI.
H.R. 4631: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 4632: Mr. BEYER and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 4663: Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 4668: Mr. STEUBE and Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. BUCHANAN.
H. Res. 114: Ms. SHERRILL and Mr. EVANS.
H. Res. 131: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H. Res. 318: Mr. HUIZENGA.
H. Res. 376: Mr. MEUSER and Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H. Res. 397: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. OBERNOLTE.
H. Res. 404: Ms. ROSS.
H. Res. 496: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ISSA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Ms. CRAIG, and Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 500: Mrs. MCBATH and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H. Res. 515: Mrs. MCCLAIN.
H. Res. 519: Mr. FALLON and Mr. JACKSON.
H. Res. 525: Mr. NORMAN, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. JACOBS of New York.
H. Res. 527: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.
H. Res. 529: Mr. FALLON and Mr. CLOUD.
H. Res. 534: Ms. BOURDEAUX.
H. Res. 541: Mr. PETERS and Mr. GOMEZ.
H. Res. 547: Ms. BOURDEAUX, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHNEIDER, and Mr. VARGAS.
H. Res. 548: Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, Mr. KINZINGER, and Mr. LONG.
H. Res. 549: Ms. OMAR, Ms. BASS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. EVANS, Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HORSFORD, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JACOBS of California, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. TORRES of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Mr. SIRES.
H. Res. 551: Ms. LOIS FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mrs. AXNE, Ms. SALAZAR, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. VICENTE GONZALEZ of Texas.